

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

LOGOS-SOPHIA: The Journal of the PSU
Philosophical Society

Philosophy

1994

Logos-Sophia

Pittsburg State University Philosophical Society

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/logos_sophia



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pittsburg State University Philosophical Society, "Logos-Sophia" (1994). *LOGOS-SOPHIA: The Journal of the PSU Philosophical Society*. 6.

https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/logos_sophia/6

This Journal is brought to you for free and open access by the Philosophy at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LOGOS-SOPHIA: The Journal of the PSU Philosophical Society by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.



LOGOS-SOPHIA

The Journal of the
Pittsburg State University
Philosophical Society



Volume VI, Spring 1994

Logo created by J. Todd Gimlin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Donald Wayne Viney 2

Articles

The Witness: The Life and Thought of Elie Wiesel
Lara Long 3

Discrimination By Any Other Name Would Still
Stink: An Analysis of Susan Faludi's *Backlash*
Kathleen Moyer 13

Sexism in Word Pairs
Lori M. Porter 21

Winners of the Women's Studies Essay Contest

1991-92 First Place, Graduate Division

Women Who Speak the Language of the Night
Deborah M. Newby 33

1991-92 First Place, Undergraduate Division

Beyond Renunciation: Female Power in Emily
Dickinson's Poetry
Dawn Davidson 41

1992-93 First Place, Graduate Division

Abortion and Conflict Theory
C. H. Patton 49

1992-93 First Place, Undergraduate Division

Feminist Psychology in Relation to Depression
and Anger in Women
Vicki O'Brien 67

Miscellaneous File

Names and Terms for God Explained 75

Constitution of the Pittsburg State University
Philosophical Society 77

Introduction

Donald Wayne Viney

A majority of papers in this issue of *Logos-Sophia* were written for the annual Women's Studies essay contest. It has been the custom, for the past several years, to publish the winning papers of that competition in *Logos-Sophia*. However, the last volume of the journal was a special issue on creation and evolution. This delayed the publication of the 1991-92 winners until this number. The PSU Philosophical Society is proud to have those papers published in this issue, along with the winners of the 1992-93 competition. At the editor's discretion, the paper by Lori A. Porter was also included. The paper won an Honorable Mention in the 1992-93 competition.

Also included in this issue is a copy of the Constitution of the PSU Philosophical Society and the answers to the crossword puzzle that appeared in the last issue.

The artwork on the cover of this issue was generously provided by Marianne Evans-Lombe. Jennifer Dwyer is to be thanked several times over for helping to proof-read the material in this issue, typing it into the computer and readying in for publication.

The Witness: The Life and Thought of Elie Wiesel

Lara Long

Never shall I forget that night, the first night in camp, which has turned my life into one long night, seven times cursed and seven times sealed. Never shall I forget that smoke. Never shall I forget the little faces of the children, whose bodies I saw turn into wreaths of smoke beneath a silent blue sky.

Never shall I forget those flames which consumed my Faith forever.

Never shall I forget that nocturnal silence which deprived me, for all eternity, of the desire to live. Never shall I forget those moments which murdered my God and turned my dreams to dust. Never shall I forget these things, even if I am condemned to live as long as God Himself. Never.

--from *Night* by Elie Wiesel

Elie Wiesel (pronounced Ellee Vizzell) was born on September 30, 1928 in a Jewish town called Sighet located in Romania. As a young child, Wiesel devoted his time to God through prayer and studying the Talmud. But in the early 1940's, Nazi soldiers slowly destroyed this Jewish community. At first, the SS soldiers befriended the community. Families offered their hospitality to the SS soldiers by housing them or inviting them to join family dinners. In return for this generosity, the SS soldiers promised to protect the Romanians. "[I]t was done according to a psychological plan to fool and blind the victim" (Wiesel, "Why Christians" 11).

Unfortunately, their deceitful messages empowered the SS soldiers to convince the people of Sighet to board the cattle cars of trains until the walls of the cars swelled, their destination unknown. Wiesel, along with his family, stepped into one of these cars. Upon reaching their destination, passengers were immediately unloaded from the cars and the determination of who would live or die commenced. The child Wiesel, a boy of fifteen, stood by his father's side. He watched as his mother and younger sister joined a different line--a line that would lead them to the gas chamber. A soldier maliciously struck Wiesel's father as the young boy watched. Wiesel describes the event in an interview, "Facing Hate with Elie Wiesel and Bill Moyers":

I write about it--that night my father all of a sudden felt he had to go to the toilet. So there was capo and he went to the capo, saying, "Can I go to the toilet?" And all of us were--hundreds and hundreds of people were there--lined up. And the capo measured him up with his look and he gave him simply a slap in the face--only one--and my father fell to the ground.

The victims of the Holocaust stepped into the concentration camps, into an artificial society created by the Nazis. Each SS soldier appointed himself in the role of God. "Nazi paganism wanted to proclaim the Aryan race as the only human one and the master of all others" (Lustiger 404). A Jew was not considered a member of the human race in the SS soldiers' eyes. Therefore, the ultimate goal of the Nazi movement was not merely to slaughter European Jews, but to annihilate the entire Jewish culture and heritage. Nazi paganism professed that Jews were racially inferior and that killing a Jew was not murder because Jews lacked human rights and were a destructive force within society. In "Extraordinary Evil or Common Malevolence? Evaluating the Jewish Holocaust," Douglas Lackey comments on the Nazis' utilitarian futuristic goals for society:

Many persons who meditated on the evils of the Holocaust have commented that one extraordinary feature of the Final Solution can be discovered in the impersonal character of the good sought by slaughter. None of these murderers (at least in theory) was to profit personally by these killings; the effect to be obtained was a better world in the future, a radically purified Utopia. (171)

The basic Nazi belief defined the killing of the Jews as a protection for the elite generations of the future. The assumption facilitated endless murders masked as a benefit to humanity.

The Nazis' artificial society resulted in amoral behavior within the concentration camps. Even on the inside, anti-semitic inmates existed. Wiesel states, "That's something we don't talk about because we are embarrassed, because it's so nice to think that there was a community of victims. There wasn't" (Wiesel, "Facing Hate"). It is a delusion to believe that the victims were righteous. Many victims stole bread, abandoned faith, left relatives, and lied in order to survive, sometimes at the cost of another person's life. The inmates' behavior must not be criticized; they were reduced to focusing only on how to survive in a culture without ethics and morals. James Farnham discusses the inmates' situation in "Ethical Ambiguity," stating, "Survivors act as they do because they must--the issue is always life or death--and at every moment the meaning and purpose of their behavior is fully known" (64). Definitely, Farnham acknowledges that psychological changes occur in the victim who is in an artificial society, forced to exist under amoral conditions. Thus, actions of the victims are without fault.

Multitudes of people became witnesses to the horror of the Holocaust--few survived. Just three months before American troops liberated Buchenwald, Wiesel's father died. Wiesel was sixteen when the liberation troops came, and he was amongst 400 children delivered

to France. "I felt that my survival was an accident, so I had to do something to give meaning to my survival," he explained in an interview ("Why Christians" 6). But before he became a "messenger to humanity," he took a vow of silence for ten years because he concluded, "When language fails, violence becomes a language. I never had that feeling. Language failed me very often, but then, the substitute for me was silence, but not violence" (Wiesel, "Facing Hate"). Finally he broke his silence in 1955.

Once liberated, Wiesel remained in France and began to study the classic philosophers of the French such as Racine. Also, he frequently studied religious texts, focusing on their philosophy. By studying in French, he realized how badly he needed a new language. In 1948, Wiesel entered the Sorbonne and continued to study philosophy. While working as a journalist in the Sorbonne, he searched desperately for a position as a foreign correspondent for Israel. Wiesel recalls how he finally landed a job with *Yediot Aharonot*, "the poorest paper imaginable. I made maybe \$50 a month. I suffered from hunger for many years, even after I came to New York [in 1956] as a correspondent" (Devereaux 39). He wrote in Hebrew for this paper and also contributed to French and Yiddish papers including the *Jewish Daily Forward*.

Wiesel completed and published an 800-page novel entitled *And the World was Silent*. He originally wrote the novel in Yiddish, but later he rewrote the novel in French and renamed it *Night*. The novel was drastically reduced to 128 pages. *Night* was well received in France, but was difficult to market in the United States. Wiesel's agent, George Borchardt characterized the attitude of American publishers as, "We don't like one-book authors. He probably won't write anything else" (Devereaux 39). But Wiesel went on to publish over eighty books. Even though he received his American citizenship in 1963, he continues to write in French, the language of his "formative years." He has also said that he has too much respect for the English language to write in it. The person who does the majority

of his translations is his wife Marion, to whom he has been married since 1969.

In *Time*, Wiesel explains his reason for writing and his experience:

There is something about this Event that eludes rational thought. Only those who were there know what it meant to be there. The others can, at best, come close to the gate. There they must stop. They will never see the fire. They will never witness the sight of children thrown into flames alive. They will never experience the fear of selections for the execution chambers. Knowledge can be shared; experience cannot. Surely not in matters related to Auschwitz. (94)

Nothing can compare to the horror the victims lived through in the ghettos or in the concentration camps. This is why theater, art and music created by non-survivors of the Holocaust cannot recapture the misery. Only victims understand. Wiesel advises, "Listen to the survivors and respect their wounded sensibility. Open yourselves to their scarred memory, and mingle your tears with theirs. And stop insulting the dead" (Wiesel, "Art" 38).

The insults to which Wiesel is referring relate directly to his frustration with the recent films, movies and art in which naked bodies are scattered all over the camps, where "the dead are stripped naked and exposed to spectators turned voyeurs" (Wiesel, "Art" 38). Death should not be turned into a curiosity for people to view. Death is a private situation, especially in the Jewish community. Each one of the six million deaths must be respected.

Wiesel believes that the greatest way to convey the tragic message of the Holocaust is through memoirs. He says, "[M]emoirs are important; witness accounts, testimonies, children's songs are important--but not novels" (Devereaux 39). Only a survivor is capable

of writing about the Holocaust with authenticity. Wiesel urges all survivors to reveal the stories of their reported deaths, even if their revelation is made simply through informal conversations. It allows survivors to contribute to the education of society. Through survivor revelations, the most documented tragedy is not reinvented. Also an important message that Wiesel stands firmly behind is: "Learn from experience. Everything should be related to the event, but nothing should be compared to it. It must retain its uniqueness, otherwise, who knows what will happen? The danger is always cheap compromise, easy analogies" (Rittner 399).

A Biblical story which can be related to the Holocaust event is the story of Abraham and Issac in Genesis, Chapter 22. God calls upon Abraham to sacrifice his son, Issac, as a burnt offering. The meaning of the name Issac is "he who laughs." How could human sacrifice and laughter be intertwined in the same story?

According to Wiesel, the story of Issac sets an example of an individual's will to defeat the hardships in life. A. R. Eckardt captures Wiesel's statement in "Divine Incongruity: Comedy and Tragedy in a Post-Holocaust World":

As the first survivor, he had to teach us, the future survivors of Jewish history, that it is possible to suffer and despair an entire lifetime, and still not give up the art of laughter. [Issac] never freed himself from the traumatizing scenes that violated his youth; the holocaust had marked him and continued to haunt him forever. Yet he remained capable of laughter. And in spite of everything he did laugh. (403)

Possibly, through God, humor assists an individual in reconciling with the party responsible for one's hardship.

Wiesel also draws from the story of Abraham and Issac the term Holocaust--the term which has come to define this period in

history. Wiesel was the first to use the term Holocaust to describe the experience of the Jewish people at the hands of the murderous Nazi movement. In an interview with *U.S. Catholic*, Wiesel recalls:

I said to myself, "What can I use to describe what happened that will combine the elements of sacrifice and fire?" The fire was significant because the Nazis burned synagogues, they burned corpses, and the fire and flames at Auschwitz were ever present. Nothing remained but ashes, and somehow God was implicated in all this. Holocaust means burnt offering, so I used the term. (13)

Recently Wiesel has begun to feel that the term Holocaust is being misused. He becomes outraged when certain groups such as Right to Life coalitions use the term in reference to the act of having an abortion, though he is sympathetic to the philosophy of the Right to Life movement. Still, nothing can be compared to the Jewish Holocaust, so Wiesel now uses the Hebrew word Chourban, which means destruction, to describe the event. Many survivors use the word amongst themselves to refer to the period of time during which they existed only in a living hell.

Wiesel's life focuses on the spiritual goal of preventing future violations against humanity. His goal is to never allow the Holocaust to fade from memory. However, by the year 2000 few survivors will be alive to educate the world about the inhumanity they personally suffered during World War II. In fact, some people choose not to listen to the realities of the Holocaust because the facts are too jolting. The facts can make such an impact on people that their minds would become restless. And this restlessness would certainly lead to change. Wiesel relies upon Ecclesiastes to help him understand people's resistance to such change: "More knowledge is more pain."

Still, Wiesel cannot understand how individuals continue to

forget the pain. He was awarded the Gold Medal of Achievement, the Government's most prestigious award available to civilians. In his acceptance speech, he reminded President Ronald Reagan of the pain he would cause if he went through with his plans to travel to a cemetery in Bitburg, West Germany and place a wreath at the grave sites of forty-seven Nazi Troopers. Exasperated, he stated, "I've given close to 40 years of my life, and if this can happen I have not achieved what I had hoped. It gives me a sense of my own nothingness, of how humble my possibilities are" (Levin 47). Furthermore, Wiesel requested that President Reagan visit universities to deliver speeches about humanity. Wiesel's message will continue to remind us of the danger lurking in the shadows of society, especially as the trend of denying the existence of concentration camps increases. Such denials continue to be announced by "revisionists" throughout the world, threatening to diminish the horrors of the Holocaust.

Teaching has been an important part of Wiesel's life for the past twenty years. He is Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Boston University, where he is also currently the Andrew Mellon Chair in Humanities. Although he teaches two courses a semester, he defers the grading in his classes to someone else because determining a grade has the potential of hurting the student, and Wiesel is uncomfortable with causing another human being pain. Of his work, Wiesel says:

I'm a disciplined person. I write four hours every day except Shabbat and Jewish holidays. Then I have four hours to read or research or study. In the other hours I do everything else. [How?] I don't sleep much. (Devereaux 40)

The majority of Wiesel's work presents questions, but he attributes the questions he poses to his faith. He explains, "It is God who taught us

the questions. And the questions are always with us" (Wiesel, "Why Christians" 8). Maybe this is why Wiesel feels that as he increases his knowledge, he understands less about the cruelty of the world. However, he has played an important role in the enlightenment of people and has encouraged the abandonment of unmerciful ways. It is a role Wiesel declares as his "messianic moment." It has given meaning to his survival.

Elie Wiesel realizes that as a survivor of the Holocaust he may never be at peace in his life. He says, "My son is probably the center of my life. When I'm with him and look at him, I feel the closest I can come to joy" ("Why Christians" 13)--even if his son is more impressed that his father threw out the first pitch for the second game of the World Series than with his father as a recipient of the 1986 Nobel Peace Prize.

Works Cited

- Devereaux, Elizabeth. "Elie Wiesel." *Publishers Weekly* 239 (1992): 39-41.
- Eckardt, A. R. "Divine Incongruity: Comedy and Tragedy in a Post-Holocaust World." *Theology Today* 48 (1992): 399-412.
- Farnham, James. "Ethical Ambiguity and the Teaching of the Holocaust." *English Journal* 72 (1983): 63-8.
- Lackey, Douglas. "Extraordinary Evil or Common Malevolence? Evaluating the Jewish Holocaust." *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 3 (1986): 167-81.

- Levin, Eric. "Ronald Reagan is Tutored on the Holocaust by One Who Survived It: Writer Elie Wiesel." *People* 23 (1985): 46-8.

- Lustiger, Jean-Marie. "The Absence of God? The Presence of God? A Meditation in Three Parts on *Night*." *America* 158 (1988): 402-06.

- Rittner, Carol. "An Interview with Elie Wiesel." *America* 158 (1988): 397-401.

- Wiesel, Elie. "Art and the Holocaust: Trivializing Memory." *New York Times* 11 June 1989: section 2 p 1.

- . Television Interview. "Facing Hate With Elie Wiesel and Bill Moyers." 27 Nov. 1991.

- . "Was He Normal? Human? Poor Humanity." *Time* 129 (1987): 93-4.

- . "Why Christians Can't Forget the Holocaust?" *U. S. Catholic* 55 (1990): 6-13.

Discrimination By Any Other Name . . . Would Still Stink: An Analysis of Susan Faludi's *Backlash*

Kathleen Moyer

Women have finally made it! Equality has "largely been won." "Women have so many opportunities," they no longer need equal opportunity policies. They are "so equal now," they no longer need the Equal Rights Amendment. During Ronald Reagan's reign as President, women gained so much ground, they "have so much," that, according to Reagan, appointments to higher office are no longer needed (Faludi ix). At least, this is what has been proclaimed by the news media, politicians, religious leaders, and even women themselves. The rest of the message, however, proclaims that while women have finally gotten what they wanted, they are miserable. "Free and equal," but completely unhappy.

Susan Faludi's hard-hitting introduction to her book *Backlash* is the two-by-four needed to gain the attention of every free-thinking person who may have been lulled or conned by the political, legal, medical, and media establishments. In the past decade women have been told that professional women (the high-powered careerists) are suffering from burnout, an infertility epidemic, and stress-induced disorders. They have been continually updated on the crisis facing single/unwed mothers: a man shortage that has them hysterical and in the throes of a debilitating lack of confidence. Childless women are depressed and confused. All independent women are plagued with severe loneliness. If women "have it all," how is it that they are so very unhappy? What is the matter now? The answer, according to the prevailing wisdom of the establishments aforementioned, is due to one reason: "it must be all that equality that's causing all that pain

. . . . Women are enslaved by their own liberation. . . . The women's movement . . . has proved women's own worst enemy" (x).

For the past ten years, there has been a constant attack on the women's movement. Respectable publications have had headlines that read like covers on tabloids such as *National Enquirer* or *Star*. The *New York Times*, *Nation*, *Newsweek*, *Vanity Fair* and others have declared the women's fight for equality responsible for every malady known to woman (as well as to man). Hollywood and prime-time television likewise have taken to portraying the single or unwed mother as a homicidal maniac ("Fatal Attraction"), harpies ("thirtysomething"), or "groveling for a groom" ("Surrender") (xi).

From politicians to law enforcement and judicial figures, women's independence is being blamed for increased crime rates. "Women are enjoying a lot more freedom now, and as a result, they are committing more crimes," says a California sheriff to the press (xii). The U.S. Attorney General's Commission on Pornography suggested that women's professional advancements could be responsible for more rapes: with more women working and in college, they "have more opportunities to be raped" (xii).

"The triumph of equality. . . has merely given women hives, stomach cramps, eye-twitching disorders, even comas" (xiii). So, wonders Faludi, if these women are so equal, who do over seventy percent of them who work full-time earn less than \$20,000 per year, lagging as far behind the average man's salary as it did twenty years ago? If women have gained as much ground as politicians claim, why are they less than eight percent of all federal and state judges, less than one percent of top corporate managers? Three out of fifty state governors are women, two of one-hundred senators are women, and two women are *Fortune* 500 chief executives. Is this equality?

This freedom has put women's reproductive choices in greater jeopardy today than ten years ago. Educationally speaking, undergraduate women receive only seventy percent of the aid given to undergraduate men in the form of grants and work-study jobs. In their

homes, women still carry the burden of over seventy percent of household chores. In thirty states, it is still legal for a husband to rape his wife. The leading cause of injury to women in the 1980's was battery. During these good years for women, federal funding for battered women's shelters was withheld. While the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner's* 1986 quote from television's "Today" show blames women's liberation for the existence of bag ladies, in the 1980's almost half of all homeless women were refugees of domestic violence.

Despite the women who have made a name for themselves by bashing the women's equality movement (like Phyllis Schlafly, Megan Marshall, Beverly LaHaye, Betty Friedan--no, your eyes are *not* deceiving you), most women credit the feminist movement with improving the quality of their lives. According to a national survey, however, less than eight percent think that their lot has worsened (xv). Where did the claim that feminism is responsible for ruining women's lives come from, and even more important, why?

American society has always resisted women's rights. The symptoms of hostility to female independence subside and rear their ugly heads periodically. Identifying feminism as women's enemy does several things for the counter-attack on women's rights. First it shifts attention from the hidden agenda of the backlash, and second it recruits women to attack their own cause. Backlashes, historically speaking, have always been triggered by the perception that women were accomplishing their goals and getting ahead. This is always interpreted (whether it is real advancement or not) by men as threatening their own masculinity. The backlash this time has been triggered not by women reaching full equality, but by the imminent possibility that they could reach it.

Psychologist Dr. Jean Baker Miller wrote, "A backlash may be an indication that women really have had an effect, but backlashes occur when advances have been small, before changes are sufficient to help many people" (xx). The backlash is not an organized

movement; this fact seems to make it even more effective. It is most powerful when it takes the face of concern, pity, and guilt, lodging inside a woman's mind until she believes it and begins to enforce the backlash on herself.

The backlash blames women for all of the crimes it perpetrates. The women's movement was blamed for the "feminization of poverty" when backlash's instigators undermined equal opportunity laws and pay equity proposals and cut the budget. Backlash perpetrators scream that women's equality is selfish and cares naught about children's rights when its own representatives in government blocked child care bills, cut federal aid for children, and loosened licensing standards on day care centers.

The attack on women has taken place in the media with extreme scare tactics geared at extremely vulnerable female Achilles heels: fertility, motherhood, vanity, and loneliness. It has taken place in politics, religion, psychology, education, government, and industry. Faludi discusses each of these areas in great detail in her book.

Faludi has, in effect, prepared a tremendous review of literature and has made some astonishing discoveries. She has not only reviewed the studies and claims made by other authors, but she has truly researched their research. In 1987, two social scientists were in the news. Shere Hite's 922-page report that was the final installment of her national survey on relationships and sexuality was attacked by the press. The findings of her book--that most women are troubled over the continuing resistance from men to treat them as equals--were not the issues of the media's attention. Nor were women's desire for independence and how it brought on increasing problems with their spouses discussed. What was scrutinized was Hite's personal life, not the work she had published. The work may have deserved to be looked over closely (her statistical approach was not above reproach), but the work was not inspected at all, only ridiculed. *Time* magazine in its October 12, 1987 article "Back Off, Buddy" called the work "highly improbable," "dubious," and "of

limited value" (5). That was probably why they gave this woman the cover and a six-page story. In the article, the women who participated in the survey were called malcontents, but they only managed to squeeze in two two-sentence quotes from the thousands quoted extensively in the study. On the other hand, plenty of space was given to Faludi's critics.

Meanwhile, Psychologist Dr. Srully Blotnick, a much-quoted expert on women's career problems, directed what he called the "largest long-term study on working women ever done in the United States" (6). Blotnick's conclusion--that "success at work poisons both the professional and personal lives of women"--was lauded by *Forbes*, *Savvy*, *The New York Times*, and "Donohue." No one doubted Blotnick's methodology, despite some obvious problems. He claimed that he had personally collected research of twenty-six gigabytes on disk memory. This is more memory than the largest federal longitudinal studies with multi-million dollar funding has. Also, Blotnick's doctorate came from an unaccredited correspondence school. When checked out by a reporter from *U.S. News and World Report*, Dr. Blotnick's resume proved completely false. But *U.S. News and World Report* was not interested in the lack of credentials and did not print the information that would have discredited Blotnick's bogus story.

Faludi looks at seemingly innocent areas in this culture and shows how the backlash has made use of feminine fears. The cosmetic--and cosmetic surgery--industry has counted on women's low self-esteem and anxiety about appearance. Under the guise of helping women to feel good about themselves, they have taken advantage of the fact that American women have more negative feelings about their bodies than any other culture studied by the Kinsey Institute (202). The backlash cut deeper than the surgeon's scalpel in this area. "Is your face paying the price of Success?" asked a Nivea face cream ad. *Mademoiselle* warned women that work stress can have a negative impact on a woman's complexion or cause dandruff, hair loss and

weight gain. Especially at risk they said were "high-achieving women" (202).

The cosmetics industry needed to take drastic measures. Since the beginning of the women's movement in the 1970's, cosmetics and fragrance companies had experienced a decline in sales. In order to turn their ailing industry around, they attempted to make women believe that they were the ailing ones and that professionalism was their ailment. Typically in times when women are moving forward in terms of equality, they feel better about themselves and use less make-up. The beauty industry may seem superficial in terms of the backlash impact, but it had the most intimately destructive effect on both female minds and bodies.

The pharmaceutical industry jumped on this bandwagon. Anti-wrinkle prescriptions exposed women to carcinogens (remember Retin-A?), acid face peels left burns, silicone injections caused deformities, cosmetic liposuction caused infections and even death. Eating disorders became common. This type of attack is typical to other backlash eras, such as the time following World War II when women were forced out of war-time jobs and independence and back into the home. Make-up and fashion changed drastically then, from unrestrictive to megafeminine.

The backlash of the 1980's was evident in the New Right. Conservative religious leaders were probably the first to state the central argument of backlash: that women's equality was responsible for women's unhappiness. Jerry Falwell, a spokesperson for the New Right, said, "The Equal Rights Amendment strikes at the foundation of our entire social structure." In the treatise *Listen America!* which devotes much space to the devastation caused by the women's movement, he vows, "I want to bury the Equal Rights Amendment once and for all in a deep dark grave" (232).

But what possible affect could a bunch of radical evangelists have upon rational, thinking Americans? Well, the Republican party national convention in 1980 accepted the New Right's anti-feminist

agenda. Their candidate for the top office distinguished himself from his predecessors by his views on women's rights: "Reagan was the first President to oppose the ERA since Congress passed it--and the first ever to back a 'Human Life Amendment' banning abortion and even some types of birth control" (236).

American industry too contributed to the backlash. Following the lead of the protectionist movement to preserve fetal rights, American Cyanamid, a chemical plant, issued a policy in the late 1970's: No fertile woman under age fifty would be allowed to work in eight of ten departments. The company's management claimed that it was getting the jump on the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), which would pass anyway, they said (446). It was, they said, worldwide. It would not be good enough for the women to take birth control pills; they would have to be sterilized if they wanted to work in the chemical industry anymore. It wouldn't even work if their husbands had vasectomies. The woman would have to have the operation if she wanted to get, or keep, her job (446).

Five women opted to have the surgery. Later that year, inspections by OSHA resulted in fines to American Cyanamid for forcing sterilization of its female employees. In addition, OSHA determined that lead exposure was high and was even more hazardous to the men in the department. The company shut down the department, and the women were the first to be laid off.

In subsequent law suits, the women lost because the judge ruled that the fetal protection policy wasn't hazardous since the women had the "option" of surgical sterilization. Typical of the many other options that the backlash granted women, the choice American Cyanamid gave these employees was presented as a "clear-cut and forward-looking development--it represented progress for women. Feminism had opened up choices for women, and now the corporation, the courts, and the rest of society claimed they were doing the same. . . .[H]ow much of a lie the backlash's language of 'choice' really was. . . in fact, their alternatives were paradoxical,

harmful, and regressive--and rigged against them from the start" (451).

The backlash was a campaign designed to thwart women's progress. This campaign was manned (pun intended) by volunteers both male and female. Despite the force with which it was delivered, women never really succumbed. Women can be effective against the backlash; it is a matter of working together, rather than struggling alone in a private war.

Faludi has written a book of extreme importance. The feminist movement is not now, nor has ever been, against men. It is a statement about people, granting them the right to expand their horizons. Both men and women would benefit from reading this classic. It serves to continue the struggle to free people to investigate other opportunities for their lives, not to do what they are told by those who feel the need to have power.

Work Cited

Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1991.

Sexism in Word Pairs

Lori M. Porter

Sexist language can be seen when analyzing word pairs. In the English language, word pairings show where the power of society is held. Frequently, this is shown when analyzing pairs of words for men and women. The morphology of the words demonstrate distinct cultural beliefs derived from the history or herstory of the English language. A word pair can exemplify the power structure and illustrate how men and women are seen in society.

When defining roles of words for men and women, linguists have used the system of etymology, the study of the derivation of words, to explain the current word meaning. Etymologies often show prejudices of "men" who research words denoting sex. Etymology is not a precise science of measurements and calculations, meaning words are subject to the cultural prejudices of etymologists in origination. These prejudices lead to misconceptions, exemplifying the power structure in language. Folk etymologies also show misconceptions of the language. Folk etymologies are histories derived through cultural prejudices and layman histories. Frequently, folk etymologists have been used with the pair *male* and *female*. In *The Philosophy of Words* (1769), Rowland Jones states *male* comes from *ma-al*, meaning *the great upon* or *the great rider*. Etymologists have supposed that *female* comes from the Latin *femina*, which some etymologists incorrectly analyzed into *fe* or *fides*, meaning *faith* and *minus*, meaning *less* (Baron 29). Basically *male* is the *powerful* and *female* is the *faithless*. *Female* entered English through the Old French *femme* and its diminutive form *femelle*, *little woman* (Rodman 284). *Female* really had nothing to do with *male*. *Male* comes from Latin *masculus*. *Male* and *female* come from completely different sources.

Female and *male*, referring to all species, are denotative words for *woman* and *man*. While the words *female* and *male* generally have no prejudices attached to them, *woman* and *man* do have several connotations associated with them. *Man* has universal significance in the English language, but *woman* only refers to a female. *Man* is used to represent all humanity and has a positive tone. Many people do not like to use *woman* because it has a negative connotation. The term is often replaced with *lady* or a softer term, but now the current fad is towards always using *woman*. Several folk etymologists believe *woman* originated from *womb-man*. *Wife* and *womb* sound similar, so the folk etymology can be understood. *Woman* comes from *wifmann*, "but even today's linguists disagree over the original sense of the Indo-European ancestor of wife" (Baron 32). Numerous linguists ignore the "primary meaning of the word 'adult female person'" (34). "Apparently many people sense that 'woman' is too blunt, too sexual, too demeaning, too clinical, or too common" (155). Today people have a problem deciding what to call females. *Female* is too much like an animal, *lady* is belittling, and *woman* is often to be avoided; the term *man* does not have this problem.

Masculine and *feminine* are not far in meaning from *male/female* and *man/woman*, but the words *masculine* and *feminine* are even murkier in connotation. *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* in 1966 defined *feminine* as "like a woman: weak; gentle; feminine delicacy," while *masculine* was anything "pertaining to or characteristic of man or men: masculine attire." But *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* of 1986 will say only, "like the qualities of a woman" and "like the qualities of a man." Today clinical and dry definitions are all most dictionaries are willing to risk. This is not true in spoken language. When asked for masculine or feminine characteristics, people give adjectives connoting cultural sexism. When honest, people say masculine attributes are stronger than feminine. It is taboo for dictionary editors to print word pairs connoting a totally different meaning. Culturally, however,

people feel the difference between the two words. These references were listed by Julia P. Stanley in *Sexism and Language* and exemplify the standard use of the masculine/feminine dichotomy. The use of *feminine* and *masculine* in daily language such as "she is so dainty and feminine," or "she has such a hulking masculine walk," show what people really believe the words mean in our society. Books are also a good example of every day language:

Difficult as the master's role may be, it is even more disquieting to admit to masochistic tendencies, since they involve dependence and helplessness, those *feminine* traits. Leather men abhor *effeminacy* (Goldstein 10)

[S]he seemed smaller, softer, more *feminine* and compliant than the Amazon who had fired arrows to the beast a hundred times her size less than two hours before. (Heinlein 175)

Another word debated is *man*. According to Sylvia Vardell, research by Joseph Schneider and Sally Hacker illustrate *man* is not perceived as universal. Schneider and Hacker used the words "social man," "industrial man" and "political man" to test their students:

In the minds of students of both sexes, use of the word *man* evoked, to a statistically significant degree, images of males only--filtering out recognition of women's participation in these major areas of life--whereas the corresponding headings ["society," "industrial life" and "political behavior"] without *man* evoked images of both males and females. In some instances the difference reached magnitudes of 30 to 40 percent. (Miller 17)

The percentage of thirty to forty percent of the attitudes is significant. The use of the generic *man* excludes woman, though the word is intended and often used to include both sexes. *Random House Webster's College Dictionary* of 1991 tries to present the first gender-neutral dictionary. Instead of *mankind*, they use *humankind*. In "Defining Womyn," Jesse Birnbaum points out that *man* is still included. People know that not long ago, *man* was not used generally, as in "all men are created equal." Our forefathers meant men, not women and men. Only since the middle 1880's has *man* been used universally.

Currently, society is moving away from the use of *man*. This can be seen in job descriptions and titles, for example, the shift from *chairman* to *chairperson* and *postman* to *mail carrier*. According to Baron, there are two main reasons for the avoidance of the word *man*. There is a degree of ambiguity in seeming only to include men. "The degree of formality is also an important factor in word choice The ornate alternatives to gender specific *man* (individual, human being, genus Homo) may be triggered by a sense that *man* is too ordinary or unimpressive" (Frank 151).

Also, the generic pronoun *he* is different from *she*. In fact, *he* is supposed to include all humankind, even though *she* doesn't, indicating that the society's power has resided in the language of men. Many books and articles present options to reform the situation of the generic *he*. People are advised to use *one*, *they*, *his or her*, switch between *he* and *she*, or omit the pronoun altogether. Each reform has its own problem. For instance, the use of the construction *he or she* becomes "awkward, particularly when it occurs repeatedly" (O'Hearn 259). In addition, the use of *one* becomes cumbersome, and alternating between *he* and *she* confuses the reader. One of the most common attempts to correct the problem is to use *they*, but the subject and the verb are supposed to agree in person and number. Therefore, people try to pluralize the entire sentence (O'Hearn 116). Often, this does not convey the same meaning. These problems have caused

many people to suggest a third pronoun. Charles Converse was among the first to recommend a neutral pronoun; he suggested *thon*. Dennis Baron lists thirty-five pronouns, including *thon* and *tey* (Baron 214). According to "feminist word-coiner Mary Daly," *thon* is considered "too bold" (Baron 214).

Word pairs are also controversial in the use of the married name. The word titles *Mr.* and *Mrs.* are not equal. Most women assume their husbands' family name when they are married. This societal rule reflects the dominance of men in society and labels women as property of men. Today it is a nuisance for women to change their names--driver's license, credit cards, social security card, school transcripts and loans have to be changed. Therefore, more women are ignoring conventions and keeping their own names. Women who want to keep their name find it is a hassle to keep their maiden name either because of questions from friends and family or because of complications in bureaucracy. These social problems show male dominance over females.

Vardell states, "Probably the subtlest form of sexist language is preferential order give to male/female paired terms" (12). Most linguists agree with Vardell. Males are almost always listed first in word order. When a person says "women and men," or "female and male," it sounds awkward. Word order is also an issue in married names. Feminists question why it is always "Mr. and Mrs." rather than "Mrs. and Mr." In her article "Sexism as Shown through the English Vocabulary," Alleen Nilsen observes that "someone chided the National Organization of Women because their charter started out with 'We, men and women . . .'" (132). Nilsen made a list of twenty-two word pairs illustrating the subordination of women: sons and daughters, kings and queens, host and hostess, boys and girls, and Jack and Jill. There is a reversal in this order when "something is so closely related to what we think of as the feminine domain" (Nilsen 132). These pairs include: bride and groom, mother and father, mother and child. The only solution is for people to habitually switch

female/male words.

A related problem with preferential order is the use of unequal pairs. This phenomena is termed by Frank "asymmetrical constructions vs. parallel terms," shown by the phrase man and wife (113). Today some people are outraged by the continuous use of *girls*. When boys grow up, they become men; when girls grown up, they remain girls. When a football coach talks to his players, he addresses them as "Men." The same coach will refer to his women's basketball team as "Girls." In fact, it would sound strange if he said "Women." "As women have been taught to value youthfulness, many take the term girl as a compliment, but the price of being eternally youthful is to never grow up" (Frank 53). When a boss refers to his secretary, he may say *my girl*, or the secretary pool may be *the girls*. The belittling of women through the use of the term *girl* conveys a message of power and relationship. Then women are helping to make themselves powerless. "The assumption that an adult woman is flattered by being called a *girl* is matched by the notion that a woman in a menial or poorly-paid job finds compensation in being called a *lady*" (Miller 167). Another asymmetrical pair is *ladies* and *gentlemen*. *Ladies* is used more frequently than *gentlemen*. *Gentlemen* is a nice term for *man*, while *lady* is used more broadly than for *woman*. Many times a speaker says "Ladies and Gentlemen." In this case, it is parallel. However, usually *lady* is used in many ways where *gentleman* is not. For example, *Salesgentlemen* don't ring up purchases, and travelers don't ask for the *gentleman's room*. Unbalanced pairing especially comes in job titles. Women are often *lady lawyers*, whereas a person never hears of *gentlemen librarians*. The inequality of word pairings is seen in *girls* and *ladies*.

The asymmetry of word pairs continues through the most denotative words. *Sister* and *brother* convey a biological relationship. *Brother* is expanded to take on a larger meaning and is supposed to be universal, yet many would argue that it excludes women. *Brother* becomes *brotherhood* and "Oh, brother" is a popular way of asking for

sympathy and goodness toward men. *Sister* cannot be applied to any of those terms. *Sister* is just used as a biological relationship except in the case of talking about the universal sisterhood of women. Two words from *sister* and *brother* also show societal (male) prejudices. *Sissy* can be applied to either a female or male wimp or coward. *Buddy* comes from brother and declares people are friends and good people.

Other words most under attack right now are word pairs with different suffixes such as *actor* and *actress*. The -ess suffix is an obvious denotation of women. The -ess suffix originated in Greek, then entered Latin and eventually came into common English through Old French after the Norman Conquest. This origin can be seen in many French adopted power words: *countess*, *mistress*, and *goddess*. Since the Norman Conquest, English has been attaching the -ess suffix to male words to denote the female form of a noun. Many feminists feel -ess degrades the female work. Currently, *waitress* is under attack. *Random House Webster's College Dictionary* of 1990 offered *waitron* and *waitperson* to correct the gender problem. The use of the suffix considerably declined in the twentieth century to a few controversial words, such as *waitress*, *mistress* and others. Another feminine suffix is -ine, meaning "having the quality of." The suffix -ine is restricted to a few words like *heroine* and can be found in many "feminine personal names, most deriving from masculines: Caroline, Ernestine, and Josephine" (Baron 123). The other productive feminine suffix is -ette, which comes from French as -ess did. In French, -ette is the smaller of the masculine derivative, and it has the additional meaning artificial. Many -ette words, like *suffragette*, *majorette*, *bachelorette*, carry negative connotations. "What has happened to words like this is that the feminine form is used as much to indicate triviality as to indicate sex" (Nilsen 38). Nilsen pointed out that when a woman conducted high-altitude tests for NASA, the headline called her an *aviator* instead of an *aviatrix*. Harriet Tubman is called a *conductor*, not a *conductress*, of the underground railroad. "Related

to this idea of seriousness vs. triviality is that a serious writer does not want to be called a *poetess* or *authoress*" (Nilsen 38).

Since the -ess, -ette, and -ine suffixes have declined in use, a hole in the language has appeared. People's need to distinguish sex in jobs is still present. Baron stated in *Modern English Usage* (1926) that Henry Fowler disputes the feminist claim which says *authoress* is derogatory and implies inequality of the sexes. Even today Stanley says people feel as Fowler did and say the female use of the male occupation title should always be marked. Some marked words of today are, as Vardell points out, job titles that have no equivalents in the other sex. She mentions *bell boy*, *paperboy*, *maid*, and *chorus girl*. These words are still marked despite reforms in language. Many feminists argue against gender-marked job titles and want common-gender nouns. Most people feel that common-gender nouns allow for ambiguity. Several linguists and feminists claim female marking discriminates against women in the work force. People who want the marking of women's jobs argue it rids the language of terms like *lady lawyer*, *woman doctor*, *woman truck driver* and, for men, *male nurse* and *male librarian*.

The marking of women's jobs conveys different meanings between word pairs. *Actor* and *actress* are balanced with respect to connotation and denotation, but consider *adventurer* or *adventuress*. An *adventurer* is a man like Indiana Jones, but an *adventuress* is a seductress. Historically *governor* and *governess* were equal words. But now a *governor* is a person of prestige and power while a *governess* is a caretaker of children. It is the same with *major* and *majorette*. *Major*, the male word, is a position of power. Many suffixes help connote a derogatory meaning to the female's side of the pair. The word pair *master* and *mistress* can be symmetrical meaning boss, but *mistress*, once paired with *master*, becomes a bed-companion.

Word pair sexism reverses sometimes in being discriminatory against males. The pair *mother* and *father* is unjust to men. "In

general, gender exclusive usage in English excludes males as parents" (August 177). The mother is considered the primary parent. Some examples are *women and their children*, not *men or parents and their children*, and *mothering* not *fathering* is synonymous to *parenting*. There are terms such as *single parent* which is almost always synonymous to *single mother*. Men are frequently left out of the equation. August states, "The idea of the mother as primary parent can be glimpsed in such expressions as *mother tongue*, *mother wit*, *mother lode*, and *mother of invention*" (177).

In addition to word pairs showing sexism in the English language, what isn't paired is also significant. August mentions that crime and evil are usually attributed to the male. He listed such words as *murderer*, *swindler*, *crook*, *burglar*, *thief*, *gangster*, and *hood* to name a few. "English usage somehow conveys a subtle suggestion that males are to be regarded as guilty in matters of law-breaking" (August 177).

Other words without parallel in masculine and feminine are *God* and the *Devil*. Some feminists are fond of the saying "When God created man, she was only kidding." No one claims that the devil is a woman, however. The devil is always portrayed as a man, whether *Satan*, *Beelzebub*, or the serpent in the Garden of Eden.

Feminists focus on animal name-calling as words that have no equivalent on the male side of the equation. Most animal terms discriminate in some manner. They convey a derogatory, sexual, or trivial characteristic of the recipient and, when used, most women bristle. A girl can be named *Kitty*, but not *Puss* or *Pussy*, and women can be *kittenish* but not *catty* or it is an insult. These contrasts demonstrate prejudices against women, not men. Men's animal terms usually convey strength. Men have *buck*, *stag*, *wolf*, and *stud* in comparison to *bunny* and *chick* for women. Compare *hen party* to *bull session*.

Lately, changes in the English language reflect the feminist movement and people's awareness of sexism in language. The

changes in rules by the National Council of Teaching English (NCTE) such as the need to never use just *he* or *she*, or *man* in reference to humankind are several of the reforms. The most noticeable change is the change in job titles. "One target of linguistic reform is the word *man*" (Baron 177). In such compound words as *policeman*, *salesman*, and *mailman*, the *man* has been changed to *person*. Some of these words have been challenged. For example, many people disapprove of the word *chairperson* because of its association with the feminist cause. In 1978, Mary Daly criticized *chairperson* as "inauthentic, obscuring women's existence and masking the conditions of our oppression" (Baron 24). *Chairperson* does not succeed in being sex-neutral, for a woman can be a *chairperson* or *chairwoman*, but a man is likely to retain *chairman*.

Changes in word pairs are found in the 1990 Random House Webster's College Dictionary in such entries as *herstory*, *chairpersonship*, *humankind*, *waitron* and *womyn*. In "Defining Womyn (and others)," Birnbaum states, "The reluctance of Random House editors to make tough perhaps even unpopular judgments is an ominous sign. Many are afraid the language is resorting to ridiculous extremes to accommodate all interest groups" (34). Birnbaum also stated that the dictionaries should be the last to accommodate radical interest groups. Many people are concerned that the changes are polluting the language. Some feminists worry that extremes like *herstory* cause "one to suspect a not-too-subtle attempt to make the whole language problem look silly" (Miller 172). Much of the concern about changes in the English language is worry of the trend moving too swiftly and the language becoming too dynamic.

The problem of how to change the language to eradicate sexism will continue. People are worried about the dilution of the language with gender-neutral words. Yet others are worried about the obvious power dominance that can be seen in marked and unmarked word pairs. Many problems exist in the language, from the generic *he* and *man* to sex specific suffixes to connotations of masculine and feminine

words. These are all issues that need consideration in female/male word pairs.

Works Cited

August, Eugene R. "Real Men Don't: Anti-Male Bias in English." *Exploring Language*. 6th ed. Ed. Gary Gosngarian. Boston: Foresman, 1992. 175-85.

Baron, Dennis. *Grammar and Gender*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.

Birnbaum, Jesse. "Defining Womyn (and others)." *Time* 24 June 1991: 34.

Frank, Francine and Frank Anshen. *Language and the Sexes*. Albany: State U of New York Press, 1983.

Goldstein, Richard. "S & M: The Dark Side of Gay Liberation." *Village Voice* 7 July 1975: 10.

Heinlein, Robert A. *Glory Road*. New York: Avon Books, 1963.

Jones, Rowland. *The Philosophy of Words*. London: Scolar, 1769.

Nilsen, Alleen Pace. "Sexism as Shown through English Vocabulary." *Sexism and Language*. Urbana: NCTE, 1972. 27-41.

O'Hearn, Carolyn. *Writing, Grammar, and Usage*. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Stanley, Julia P. "Gender-Marking in American English: Usage and Reference." *Sexism and Language*. Urbana: NCTE, 1972. 43-74.

Swift, Casey and Kate Swift. "One Small Step for Genkind." *Exploring Language*. 6th ed. Ed. Gary Gosngarian. Boston: Foresman, 1992. 162-74.

Vardell, Sylvia M. "I'm No Lady Astronaut: Non-Sexist Language for Tomorrow." Fourth Annual Spring Conference of NCTE. Houston, Texas, 28-30 March, 1985.

Women Who Speak the Language of the Night

Deborah M. Newby

When literary aficionados hear the words "science fiction," images of giant ants, drooling aliens, half-naked women with large swords, flying saucers, and the end of the world through radiation, pollution or alien invasion come to mind. In fact, many people classify science fiction with the worst of commercial fiction. They feel that because of its emphasis on science or the supernatural, speculative fiction (SF) does not contain literary depth of character or theme and that its stories remain simplistic space operas or, at best, plot stories written solely to reveal a new and amazing idea. Part of the blame for their opinion falls on Hollywood's B-grade "sci-fi" movies. These movies still influence many people to equate today's SF with the Bug-Eyed Monster pulp stories of the 1920's and 30's. Therefore, despite the fact that not all SF is escapist and elementary, the truly excellent writers who use SF themes tend to become trapped in a literary ghetto, unable to attract any serious review of their work.

Another drawback of speculative fiction centers around the male-dominated aspect of the field itself. For example, despite the fact that reference books, such as James Gunn's *Alternate Worlds: The Illustrated History of Science Fiction*, accepts Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* as the first SF novel (Gunn 45), H. G. Wells and Jules Verne are commonly remembered as the fathers of science fiction. Especially in the years from 1900 to 1960, women characters in SF did not exist except as hapless heroines, romantic prizes, or servants (an English literary tradition since *Beowulf*). Women writers during this time became invisible as well, taking male *noms' de plume*, a practice that continues even today.

With these rather grim facts in mind, why would contemporary women writers choose speculative fiction--a male-dominated literary ghetto--to explore the role of women? Does SF somehow provide a medium for the exploration of what it means to be a woman that realistic fiction cannot provide? Part of the answer exists in representative works of three contemporary female writers: Ursula Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness*, Suzette Haden Elgin's *The Judas Rose*, and Doris Lessing's *The Memoirs of a Survivor*. These novels show how the truth of women's roles in contemporary society can be revealed through futuristic themes and settings. The other part of the answer rests inside the creative minds of the authors themselves.

Ursula Le Guin, whose awards include a Newberry Silver Medal and a National Book Award, writes in her introduction to *The Left Hand of Darkness* that although "extrapolation is an element in science fiction, it isn't the name of the game by any means. It is far too rationalist and simplistic to satisfy the imaginative mind" (i). To Le Guin, there is not much difference between SF and older forms of fiction, especially since she feels that "all fiction is metaphor" (vi). Thus, she thinks of SF as a thought-experiment, an experiment where the purpose is not to guess the future, but to describe present day reality (ii) and reverse habitual ways of thinking (*Night* 163).

In *The Left Hand of Darkness*, Le Guin certainly succeeds in overturning conventional assumptions. The basic story centers around the first person narrator Genly Ai, an envoy from Earth sent to the planet Winter to invite the Gethenians to join a family of similar planets known as the Ekumen. But the main conflict which grows out of Genly Ai's inexperience is not the only the important focal point of the book. The culture of Winter with its androgynous natives provides a society where the inhabitants are sexless except for a short period of kemmer (sexual potency). Since every native of Winter has the capacity to become either male or female during kemmer, no sexual distinctions or discriminations can exist among the Gethenians. This creates a society where the absence of sexuality is a continuous factor.

Another interesting result of Le Guin's androgynous population is the absence of war. Of course individual and clan conflicts still exist. But entire countries do not mobilize, and the Gethenians do not spend their time inventing new and more deadly weapons. The Gethenians are also free from the concept of rape, both individual and ecological. When imprisoned in the forest region of Tarrenpeth, Genly Ai immediately notices how carefully the forest has been husbanded. He says that "though the forest had been logged for centuries, there were no waste places in it, no desolation of stumps, no eroded slopes. It seemed that every tree was accounted for" (176).

Le Guin wrote this book because she wanted "to define and understand the meaning of sexuality and the meaning of gender" (*Night* 161). Many times during *The Left Hand of Darkness*, Le Guin accomplishes this purpose by showing Genly Ai and Therem struggling to arrive at a mutual understanding. At one point, Therem asks if women on Earth are a different species from men. Genly tries to define woman, finds he cannot, and admits that "women are more alien to me than you are" (235).

Suzette Haden Elgin uses this difference between men and women as the basis of *The Judas Rose*. In this novel, Elgin uses the linguistic hypothesis that language structures perceptions and that for every language there are perceptions it cannot express. Elgin's personal hypothesis, based on the modern French linguistic theory that existing human languages are inadequate to express the perception of women, leads her to invent a new language for women called Laadan. This language makes a tremendous difference in the lives of Elgin's female characters, enabling them to understand and deal with men without struggling for dominance. As Laadan changes the women, the men change also. Therefore, although the future world of *The Judas Rose* contains no freedom for women, Nazareth Chornyak and the other female linguists come to see Laadan as their great hope. They understand that as Laadan spreads, society as a whole will be transformed. *The Judas Rose* becomes not only the surface story of

how Nazareth and the other women introduce Laadan to other women in the world, but also the story of how the world itself will be transformed through the power of language.

Doris Lessing, like Elgin, also wishes to transform the reality of women's lives in her fictional worlds. She tends, however, to explore the transformations of reality through the use of the metaphysical rather than the concrete. Lessing, whose book *The Memoirs of a Survivor* is often said to be her most important work, uses an unnamed first person narrator to explore the role of women.

The story takes place in London during the disintegration of modern society following a war or some other great catastrophe that remains unspecified. Although a type of bureaucracy still remains, most of the inhabitants of London must survive as best as they can. At the beginning of the story, the narrator, a middle-aged woman, is suddenly and inexplicably given a twelve-year-old girl, Emily, to care for. Lessing then uses the remainder of *The Memoirs of a Survivor* to explore the relationship between the two women amidst the continuing breakdown of civilization. As the story continues, the narrator becomes a reflection of larger events, both external and internal. In essence, the narrator is every woman, and Lessing uses her to explore what womanhood means on a universal scale. For example, when Emily grieves for the loss of her friend June, she at first cries violent shocked tears--a child's tears. Later though, Emily "weeps as a woman weeps, which is to say as if the earth were bleeding" (168). The narrator observes this and asks, "Who else can cry like that? Not an old woman. The tears of old age can be miserable, as bad as anything you like. But they are tears that know better than to demand justice" (168).

Lessing also uses the narrator's observation of Emily to illustrate how male/female roles quickly revert to old patterns. When the narrator wonders why Emily does not set up her own tribe instead of clinging to her unfaithful lover, Gerald, she finally admits her cultural blindness. "The attitudes of women towards themselves and

to men, the standards women had set up for themselves, the gallantry of their fight for equality, the decades-long and very painful questioning of their roles" (101-08) makes it difficult for the older woman to see the truth. Emily and the other girls like her are in love, and in their love, leadership never occurs to them.

Thus, in *The Memoirs of a Survivor*, futuristic themes help to expose and delineate the current roles of women by magnifying existing relationships to the extreme. Through this technique, Lessing, Le Guin, and Elgin show how both women and men are kept in bondage through the subjugation of one sex over another. Le Guin accomplishes this magnification by creating a race of genderless people whose relationships are thrown into juxtaposition with Earth's sexuality. Elgin does it by removing centuries of women's rights and using this view of women to reflect today's relationships. Lessing confines the scope of her novel to the narrator, magnifying one woman's point-of-view to examine the collapse of civilization. These three visions are not utopian, but they do offer symbolic alternatives to current male/female interactions.

For example, Le Guin believes that "our problems today are caused by a search for dominance instead of a search for balance and integration" (*Night* 169). This opinion reflects the most important theme in defining women's roles in all three books: dualism and the search for wholeness. In *The Left Hand of Darkness*, Therem and Genly Ai are isolated and alone on a large glacier for many months. As they try to work out their relationship--two aliens struggling to understand and care for one another--they explore this dualism. One night, Therem recites one of the sayings of his people: "Light is the left hand of darkness and darkness the right hand of light. Two are one, life and death, lying together like lovers in kemmer, like hands joined together, like the end and the way" (234-35). Later, in the trip across the ice, Genly shares the yin/yang symbol with Therem. He says, "It is yin and yang. Light is the left hand of darkness. . . how did it go? Light, dark. Fear, courage. Cold, warmth. Female,

male. It is yourself, Therem. Both and one" (267).

Le Guin uses the idea of the Chinese yin and yang to create balance. She wants to combine the "driving linearity of the 'male,' the pushing forward of the limit, the logicity that admits no boundary--and the circularity of the 'female,' the valuing of patience, ripeness and practicality" (165-66). This dualism succeeds, not only in defining every Gethenian individual, but the Gethenian culture as a whole. It also acts as a metaphor for our own culture. There on the ice of Winter, between two aliens, exists the ideal of human sexual relationships: all persons accepted for their uniqueness, yet bound together equally to form a strong whole. In other words, *The Left Hand of Darkness* says that women today can never be transformed into a greater whole until a change of perception occurs. All people, both men and women, must relinquish their struggle for dominance.

In *The Judas Rose*, Elgin also writes about the eventual merging together of men and women, a dualism of relationships. However, this merging together will occur through the intervention of women and their language, Laadan, and not through any direct male action. At the end of the novel, after Nazareth has discovered that the language has been safely spread to the non-linguist women, she reflects on the changes Laadan will eventually have upon men:

Meanwhile, Laadan would spread. . . . It would continue to keep all women who knew it immune to the state of violence that the men struggled with so incessantly; it would continue to provide the women with the patience necessary to bring the men out of those endless loops of violence always begetting more violence. The day would come when they would have a war, and all the men would just look at each other and laugh and just go home. (355)

Men and women's relationships in Elgin's world will be changed as

a direct result of the women's actions and their patient enduring. In many ways, this reflects the history of women and women's literature since the Middle Ages; women's rights move slowly built upon the patience and sacrifice of others.

Doris Lessing's dualism takes a different form, a total integration of the intuitive world with the rational. In *The Memoirs of a Survivor*, the narrator periodically sees an alternate reality behind the paint and wallpaper of her living room wall. The novel ends when the other place becomes real enough for the narrator, Emily, Gerald, Hugo, and the wild children to step "out of this collapsed little world into another order of world altogether" (213). Although this casting off of the real world for the intuitive world can be seen as a symbolic acceptance of the new patterns of life required in an apocalyptic society, it is more likely representative of an actual move beyond the rational world into a higher intuitive existence. In arriving at this other existence though, Emily and Gerald's roles are reversed, with Emily now leading the family group into a new order of life. Like *The Judas Rose*, *The Memoirs of a Survivor* portrays women as having the ability to change and transform relationships.

Lessing's novel and the novels of Le Guin and Elgin help define and reflect women's lives in today's society. Their science fictional themes are as important as those of any realistic novel dealing with the concerns and possibilities of women. Perhaps they are even more important since these three writers have portrayed a form of the truth which can never be told in the real world in quite the same way. Therefore, their unique visions become not only metaphor but hope, a hope that with an increased understanding of themselves, today's women can take control of their lives and continue to change society through example, patience, and determination.

Perhaps Ursula Le Guin best sums up the importance of fantasy and imagination. She writes, "We like to think we live in daylight, but half the world is always dark; and fantasy, like poetry, speaks the language of the night" (*Night* 11).

Works Cited

- Elgin, Suzette Haden. *The Judas Rose*. New York: Daw Books, 1987.
- Gunn, James. *Alternative Worlds: The Illustrated History of Science Fiction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Le Guin, Ursula. *The Language of the Night*. Ed. Susan Wood. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1979.
- . *The Left Hand of Darkness*. New York, Ace Books, 1969.
- Lessing, Doris. *The Memoirs of a Survivor*. New York: Knopf, 1975.

Beyond Renunciation: Female Power in Emily Dickinson's Poetry

Dawn Davidson

During the nineteenth century, women of all classes occupied a secondary position to men. According to Wendy Martin, "No matter how gifted or intelligent their daughters, most Victorian fathers felt that their female children could not survive in the male world" (88). Instead, "conduct books filled with sentimental platitudes about the angelic, self-sacrificing role of women" were written, books that "reflected a traditional belief that women should not be intellectually active because mental exertions was considered detrimental to female health" (88). Men, such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, Lord Byron and Goethe, created an ideology of femininity that required all women to renounce their own needs and desires in deference to men's. Thus, men could have passion and power, but women were expected to be passionless, powerless, selfless angels.

The dissonance between the male-conceived feminine ideology and women's reality served as a dilemma for women writers. In *Madwoman in the Attic*, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar comment:

given the maze of societal constraints by which women poets have been surrounded since Anne Finch's day, it is no wonder that some of the finest of the writers have made whole poetic careers out of the virtue of necessity, [or] a passionate renunciation of the self-assertion lyric poetry traditionally demands, and at its most ironic seemingly demure resignation to poetic isolation or obscurity. (564)

Emily Dickinson, a poet and semi-recluse of the nineteenth century, also discovered the disparity existing between man's ideology and women's reality. As she warns, "Tell all the Truth but tell it slant" (#1129)¹. Dickinson seems to speak for women writers "who in every century have been inhibited both by economic and legal dependence and by the awareness that *true writer* signifies assertion while *true woman* signifies submission" (Ostriker 6). Yet Dickinson was not always "inhibited." Using the immortality of poetry, Dickinson also proclaimed female power in the face of Man and his ideology.

As Dickinson examines the "paradoxical pleasures of such painful renunciation" (Gilbert and Gubar 564), she creatively approaches it from different perspectives. Disclosing that "'Tis Beggars--Banquets--can define/ 'Tis Parching--vitalizes Wine--" (#313), she reveals that those who do without the extravagance of the basics of food and drink appreciate them better when served. As she exalts pain and suffering "through Calvaries of Love" (#322), she uses the sacrificial image of Christ at Calvary to convey an understanding of the male-imposed doctrine of sacrificial love. She also reveals a careful perception of the ideal's requirements as she remarks that the selfless female is "the slightest in the House--," taking "the smallest Room--" (#486) as she denies herself of anything more than the least. She fulfills the ideals of femininity as she "never spoke--unless addressed--/ And then, 'twas brief and low--," but recognizes "How noteless--[she] could die--" under the male society's oppression.

Yet Dickinson goes further in her renunciation by taking the "noteless" death and turning it into a triumphant crucifixion. As she reveals that "They're here, though; not a creature failed--/ No Blossom stayed away/ In gentle deference to me--/ The Queen of Calvary" (#348), she becomes the most selfless and the most sacrificial of all women. Taking her sacrifice to its limits, Dickinson discloses that "God gave a loaf to every Bird--/ But just a Crumb--" to her (#791). Becoming more renunciatory than the animals, she

treasures her crumb as a "poignant luxury--/ to own" and "touch" as "Such Plenty smiles upon [her] Board--" that her "Garner shows so fair--." As she selflessly sacrifices everything except for a small "Pellet" of food, she "wonder[s] how the Rich--may feel--/ An Indiaman--An Earl--" as she "with but a Crumb--" is "Sovereign of them all--."

But Dickinson's claim of total renunciation seems to shift its focus as she declares that "Title divine--" is hers, "Empress of Calvary!/
Royal--All but the Crown!" (#1072). Probing the concept that being married gives a woman worth, Dickinson appears to wonder if the wedding day is such a "Tri Victory" when the woman is "Born--
Bridalled--Shrouded--/ In a Day." Asking "Is *this* the way" to self worth, she moves past the ideology of femininity to the reality of women's lives.

Indeed, as Alicia Ostriker points out, Dickinson's "poems on the institution of marriage are elliptically but profoundly ironic. Her poems on her own powers as a poet are covertly yet fiercely boastful and defiant" (39). In fact, although she "had dozens of feminine examples [of] renunciation of love as well as ambition," which are "deeply within the feminine tradition by Dickinson's time," she "emphatically rejects the cult of True Womanhood" (38). Instead she becomes what Adrienne Rich calls a "figure of powerful will" (314), who must "retranslate her own unorthodox, subversive, sometimes volcanic propensities into a dialect called metaphor" (315). Moreover, Rich reveals that "it is always what is under pressure in us, especially under pressure of concealment--that explodes in poetry" (315).

It seems strange then that Dickinson should declare, "I'm Nobody! who are you?" seemingly referring to herself as without self in the epitome of renunciation. Claiming that it is "dreary--to be--
Somebody," she appears to reflect renunciation's doctrine of self-effacement and privacy, stating also "How public--like a Frog--/ To tell one's name--the livelong June--/ To an admiring Bog" (#288). However, Ostriker points out that "completing the first stanza's

implied set of antithesis, Nobody mockingly dissects Somebody" (40). In fact, such a poem as "I'm Nobody" (#288) is duplicitous in that it means both what it says and its opposite" (40). Indeed, "for women writers in the nineteenth century, duplicity was the one royal road to artistic triumph," and "as a consequence, the greatest women writers are usually the most profoundly and excitingly duplicitous" (41). As Rich also points out, "Emily Dickinson's is the only poetry in English by a woman of that century which pierces so far beyond the ideology of the 'feminine' and the conventions of womanly feeling" (324). Ostriker agrees, adding that "Dickinson's artistry exceeds others' because, although she may have feared much, she did not fear her own mind" (42). As such, she is "the first woman poet whose poetic language and structures systematically register and resist the dominance of masculinity and rationality in culture" (43).

Echoing Dickinson's resistance against a masculine dominance, Joanne Diehl claims that "gender identity affects the course of poetic influence itself" (9) and that Dickinson is aware of her "estrangement" that her "exclusionary relation" to the male poetic tradition creates (11). Yet as Martin indicates,

Dickinson's recognition of the need to create her own cosmology, to respect her intelligence and creativity, and to develop her poetic craft demonstrates unusual wisdom and independence, and it is this extraordinary individuality that characterizes her work and career. (84)

It is such an awareness and intelligence that allows Dickinson to draw on the female metaphors of the "Darkness" and the "Moon" (#419) as she moves from a concrete description of night travel to a spiritual revelation of poetic truth or vision. As she discusses "her Goodbye," she transfers the physical truth of sight adjustment ("We grow accustomed to the Dark--/ When Light is put away--") to a female

poet's search "of larger--Darkness--/ Those Evenings of the Brain" for something that "Adjusts itself to Midnight--/ And Life steps almost straight." Probing also the nineteenth century double standard that allows a man to do freely as he pleases ("He should jump Peninsulas"), Dickinson imagines herself as a "Meadow Bee" that can "flirt all Day with Buttercups" and "dwell a little everywhere/ Or better, run away" (661). Recognizing that from freedom comes power and that nineteenth-century women were not allowed freedom, Dickinson claims "What Liberty!" from the "Dungeons" of male-contrived ideology.

Moreover, as Rich indicates, "To recognize and acknowledge our own interior power has always been a path mined with risks for women; to acknowledge that power and commit oneself to it as Emily Dickinson [does is] an immense decision" (318). Gilbert and Gubar further add that Dickinson faces "the double bind" of the woman poet: "on the one hand, the impossibility of self-assertion for a woman, on the other hand, the necessity of self-assertion for a poet" (584).

Dickinson seems to transcend such a bind, though, as she follows her exploration of freedom and power with the interpretation that the soul, or the self, has strength, and that freedom equals power. Using powerful word choices instead of renunciatory word choices to describe, Dickinson reveals that the "Soul unto itself/ Is an imperial friend" (#683) that has power. She challenges that the soul is "Secure against its own--/ No treason it can fear--/ Itself--its Sovereign--of itself/ The Soul should stand in Awe--." Writing forcefully, Dickinson illustrates that the woman can be "Sovereign" of her own soul and "stand in Awe" of its power without the male dominance. By the force of her poetry, Dickinson also reveals that "neither an inner sea nor a mother named Awe can be renounced: both are facts of blood, inescapable inheritances" (Gilbert and Gubar 590). It almost seems as if Dickinson perceives that she can "avoid the necessity of renouncing her art by renouncing, instead, that concept of womanliness which require[s] self-abnegating renunciation" (590).

"Manacles be dim--," she points out, "To the new Free--/ Liberty--Commoner--" than the shackles of "Yesterday" (#728). Recognizing that the "Manacles" create a powerlessness while "Liberty--Commoner--" gives a sense of power, she pauses to wonder if "Bonds hurt more/ Than Yesterday?/ Wouldn't Dungeons sorer grate/ On the Man--free--." By transcending the oppression and restriction that women have known for so long under men, Dickinson breaks from the ideology of femininity, claiming her own freedom as she appeals to "God of Manacle/ As of the Free--/ Take not my Liberty/ Away from Me--."

However, as Dickinson declares her freedom, she still must reckon with a nineteenth-century double standard that denies the woman while exalting the man. In an angry tone, she demands, "Who Court obtain within Himself/ Sees every Man a King--"; "Who can add a Crown/ To Him who doth continual/ Conspire against His Own" (#803). Rejecting the restrictive ideology, Dickinson lashes out at men who glorify themselves while oppressing and subjugating women. She then proclaims female power, the power of choice, as she asserts that "The Soul Selects her own Society--/ Then--shuts the Door--/ To her divine Majority--/ Present no more" (#303). By identifying the "Society" and the "Majority" as female rather than male, Dickinson gives glory and power to the female self. She also creates "her" world where she is ruler and where "Emperor[s] be kneeling/ Upon her Mat--" to see "her divine Majority--." Gilbert and Gubar comment:

[T]he fact that Dickinson's poetry suggests such complicated relationships between female Self and the male Other immediately suggests also the complexity of her art as well as the insistent ambiguity with which even at her most humble and 'innocent' she reconcile[s] those apparent opposites of feminine submission and poetic assertion. (587)

Dickinson does so by boldly asserting that "No Rack can torture me/ My Soul--at Liberty--" (#384), acknowledging that her freedom is her power. She also affirms "That Lever cannot pry--/ And Wedge cannot divide/ Conviction--That Granitic Base--" (#789) of female power. Signifying a sense of knowledge of her poetic power and genius, Dickinson declares,

Bind me--I still can sing--
Banish--my mandolin
Strikes true within--

Slay--and my Soul shall rise
Chanting to Paradise
Still thine. (#1005)

As she creates an inspiring vision of the poem outliving the poet, Dickinson also seems to construct a powerful and affirmative statement that women's writing "can sing" and always "shall rise/ Chanting to Paradise--."

Realizing that renunciation is only a male-conceived and imposed doctrine to keep women restricted, Emily Dickinson discovered and claimed the power of freedom and choice in her poetry. Writing herself out of a confining ideology of femininity, Dickinson exposes her male contemporaries' myths and created a female power in her poetry.

Notes

¹Johnson, Thomas H., ed. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1960. All poems cited are from this edition and will be identified by the poem number.

Works Cited

- Diehl, Joanne Feit. *Dickinson and the Romantic Imagination*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Gilbert Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980.
- Martin, Wendy. *An American Triptych*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: U of North Carolina P, 1984.
- Ostriker, Alicia Suskin. *Stealing the Language: The Emergence of Women's Poetry in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.
- Rich, Adrienne. "Vesuvius at Home: The Power of Emily Dickinson." *Women's Voices*. Eds. Pat C. Hoy II, Esther H. Schor and Robert DiYanni. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990. 313-30.

Abortion and Conflict Theory

C.H. Patton

Introduction

Abortion has been one of the most hotly debated issues in the United States during the last third of the twentieth century. Political candidates from both major political parties have won or lost elections at the state and national levels because of their position on this single issue. Violence has erupted in the streets between the pro-life and pro-choice groups since the United States Supreme Court upheld the *Roe v. Wade* decision.

This paper analyzes the abortion issue in the United States today by using a conflict-theory approach. Conflict-theory emphasizes the role of power, particularly economic power, and of coercion in maintaining order in society (Ritzer 106-107). Power is the capacity of a person or group to achieve a specific goal, even when opposed by others (Persell 418).

Two points will be taken as a thesis: (1) that abortion prohibition was just one of the mores employed to deny women equality with men and (2) that the abortion issue was a key instrument used by the regular doctors to establish their professionalism and assisted in establishing the American Medical Association as one of the most powerful quasi-legal bureaucracies in the United States.

According to Karl Marx, one of the leading contributors to conflict theory, "The History of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (419). Therefore, it seems appropriate to begin with the historical background of the abortion issue.

Early Birthing and Abortion History

Childbirth among primitive people has always been considered a natural process, often treated indifferently and sometimes brutally. "During the middle ages childbirth agony was supposed to be the consequence and expiation of carnal sin, a clerical interpretation of Genesis 3:16" ("Abortion" 14). This attitude fit perfectly into the alliance of the Christian Church and the Imperial Power of Rome in the need for control of the masses and was brought about by the thinking of St. Augustine who by his own admission could not control or satisfy his sexual desires (Reiss 196). Physicians attended pregnant women during early Greece and Rome, but this practice had been discontinued and only midwives were available to the expectant mother. This was an exercise of the religious power of the male-dominated priesthood over women.

Induced abortion is ignored in Judeo-Christian writings; it is not mentioned in the Christian or Jewish Bible. Abortion in the Roman Empire was widespread, and Pliny wrote about prescribed drugs for this purpose. Roman law held that the unborn child was not a person. After the beginning of the Christian era, such laws as existed were to protect the fathers' rights, not the embryos (Luker 12). In 1100 A.D. Ivo of Chartres condemned abortion, but held that abortion of the unformed embryo was not murder. This was confirmed fifty years later by Gratian in his work that became Canon Law for the next 700 years (Luker 13).

Early Midwifery History: Rise of Male Dominance in Medicine

The conflict between women's traditional wisdom and male expertise centered on the right to heal. . . . For all but the very rich, healing had traditionally been the prerogative of women. . . . The triumph of the male medical profession involved the destruction of women's

networks of mutual help, leaving women in a position of isolation and dependency and it established a model of expertism as the prerogative of a social elite. (Ehrenreich and English 34)

This destruction was centered within the witch hunts of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and the major targets were healing women. "If a woman could heal without having studied, the Catholic Church declared in the fourteenth century that she was a witch and must die" (Corea 21). The chief opponents of the female healer were men drawn into the possibility of medicine as a lucrative practice and were trained primarily by apprenticeship, two or three years at a medical school, or in some instances by both methods. There were no formal standards to meet (Ehrenreich and English 42).

Forceps, developed by the Chamberlains' (and kept secret for a hundred years), aiding men to perform Version (turning a malpositioned baby in the uterus) was not unknown to women as Cleopatra had taught it in the first century A.D., but the fear of being condemned as a witch prevented them from performing this and the male had to be called upon to use his instruments. After the forceps became public around 1700, men gradually drove women from midwifery (Corea 51). However, midwives, in many cases, remained the only source of help for women in remote areas or for those who could not afford a physician.

In the sixteenth century the attitude that women must suffer pain during childbirth started to change somewhat. In 1847, Queen Victoria's physician Sir James Simpson gave her chloroform during the birth of her children in spite of the protests by the Church, and this practice soon became popular as the Queen's way. Here we have the religious institution protesting humane treatment of women during childbirth.

In 1865, Dr. James Edmunds established statistics that showed one death per 556 births delivered by midwives at the Royal Maternity

Charity, while among private London patients delivered mostly by medical men one in every 204 died (Corea 244). Maternal death rates in the United States remained high, 6.7 per 1000 live births in 1930 ("Abortion" 14), so there is little wonder that women sought out abortion. However, by comparison, Sweden experienced only 2.8 deaths per 1000 in 1929, even though eighty percent of the deliveries were performed by midwives (Corea 255).

Birth, Disease and Abortion in the 19th Century

The dominant medical theory of the early nineteenth century centered on the human body as being a system of intake-outflow and any blockage of this being a matter of disease. Blockage of the menstrual flow fit into this category, and numerous emmenagogues were available and prescribed by physicians in good faith, "especially in the absence of accurate pregnancy tests" (Luker 18). Newspaper advertisements for patent medicines designed to bring on suppressed menses were common and even appeared in church newsletters. Discreet advertisement of clinics for women with menstrual irregularities were also common. A typical example is an 1873 San Francisco advertisement for a doctress specializing in female irregularities:

Doctress A. M. Hoffman 4422 Folsom St. between 10th and 11th, 30 years experience; has her diploma of the highest school of Germany, will thoroughly treat all Diseases of Women and Children; She would intimate to Ladies suffering from Uterine Disorders that she has a sure specific for female irregularities. All communications strictly confidential. She has lately added a first-class Lying In Hospital where patients can receive the best of medical attendance. (Luker 19)

Rise of Class Interest

Between 1800 and 1820, regular doctors were able to get seventeen states to pass licensing laws restricting the practice of medicine. The regular doctors and state legislators of this period were from the upper and middle classes. The doctors convinced the legislators that medicine, like other gentlemen's professions, should be restricted to those who held diplomas or who had apprenticed with practitioners of the appropriate social class and training (Wertz and Wertz 136). In most cases, local and state regular medical societies were given the power to grant licenses; in ten states, the unlicensed practice of medicine was made punishable by fine or imprisonment (Ehrenreich and English 47). It appears that the regular doctors not only met Marx's criteria of constituting a class, but were a quasi-legal bureaucracy within several states. Their legitimacy stemmed from the state, yet they had the power to determine their own membership. "Women could not join this club because no physician would take a woman as an apprentice and no school would admit one as a student" (Ehrenreich and English 42). The development of this type of bureaucracy was what Max Weber, in his critical theory approach, feared the most (Antonio and Glassman 24).

The belief that abortion is murder was not yet a part of the Roman Catholic Church dogma. The clergy was influenced more by the Physicians than the other way around. Doctors used the transformation in the demographics of abortion to awaken the Protestant middle and upper class racist fears regarding the ethnic makeup of the United States. Between 1800 and 1900, the birth rate for white American women dropped approximately fifty percent, while there was a marked increase in the visibility of abortion (Tribe 32).

The American Medical Association was founded in 1847 for the purpose of upgrading and protecting the profession. In 1859, a resolution condemning abortion was passed and state legislators were urged to pass laws forbidding it. In 1864, the AMA established a

prize to be awarded to the best anti-abortion book written for the lay public. The group concluded in 1871 that twenty percent of all pregnancies were deliberately aborted (Luker 19-20).

Physicians of this period gave two reasons for their being so involved in the abortion issue. First, because of their ignorance about the proper value of embryonic life, American women were committing a moral crime. Second, it was the doctors' duty to save women from their own ignorance because they had new scientific knowledge that proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the embryo was a child from the moment of conception (Luker 21).

It seems that the first of these arguments places the physician in the position of usurping moral decisions from the church. The second argument seems suspect in light of perviously accepted Canon Law that vivification was held to happen no earlier than forty days for a male and eighty days for a female. In addition, it appears that even among the learned physicians there was considerable disagreement regarding abortion, and at no place was the danger of childbirth to the prospective mother addressed. To further the concept of women's ignorance, doctors commonly believed that during menstruation women's limited bodily energy was diverted from the brain, rendering them idiotic. Horatio Stoner opposed women becoming surgeons on the grounds that "the periodical infirmity of their sex . . . in every case unfits them for any responsible effort of mind" (Wertz and Wertz 139).

As for the physicians new scientific evidence that the embryo was a child from the moment of conception, it must be remembered that bloodletting was still a popular therapy for many symptoms as was the application of leeches in the 1850's (Wertz and Wertz 142). The newly formed male-dominated American Medical Association added a new dimension to the concept of women: In addition to suffering during childbirth because of original sin, women are now considered unfit for rational thought.

Change in Social Structure

The period between 1850 and 1900 also saw a dramatic change in the social structure in the United States from primarily rural to an urban society. "Birth rates for white women fell from an estimated 7.04 births per woman to 3.56 [per woman] between 1800 and 1900" (Luker 15). Yet it was between 1850 and 1900 that physicians were the most active in their lobbying for new laws, and by 1900 every state in the union had strict laws against abortion.

Strict abortion laws were the product of lobbying by the medical profession and reflected the increased professionalization of the field of medicine (Tribe 30). Regular doctors, probably more than any other group in American society during the nineteenth century, including the clergy, defended the value of human life per se as an absolute (Mohr 36). By 1900, only six states did not include a therapeutic exception clause in their laws stating that any abortion undertaken by a physician to preserve the life of the mother was legal. This in effect gave physicians almost unlimited discretion in deciding when an abortion was necessary (Luker 32). Also the definition of life was left up to the physicians. They could use the narrow meaning of physical life or take the broad meaning of quality of life.

Awakening to the Delusion

From 1900 until the surfacing of the Finkbine case in 1962, the abortion conflict was generally low key in nature. Decisions on abortion were between a woman and her doctor with the doctor having the final say in the matter. Abortion had become a scientific/medical issue. With the growing prestige of science, the clergy, lawyers and women were in no position to politically challenge the medical profession. Moreover, none of these three groups felt the need to challenge the physicians. The clergy supporting the narrow interpretations of life-saving (that abortion was permissible only when

the mother's physical life was otherwise in danger) believed that this was the guideline being followed, while those supporting the broad guideline believed that their views were being upheld (that the quality of life for the mother, the expected child, and the mother's family, if any, was taken into consideration). The attorneys believed the letter of the law was being upheld. Physicians questioning the abortion practice of colleagues were raising questions not about moral standards but about technical competence--and physicians have been reluctant to publicly challenge the technical expertise of their colleagues (Luker 45). But, the publicity accompanying the Finkbine case¹ shattered these illusions.

The first visible function derived from the Finkbine case was the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision upholding the Fifth Federal Circuit Court decision that declared the abortion laws of Texas unconstitutional. The ruling released on January 22, 1973 by the Supreme Court specified that the United States Constitution protects a woman's right to decide whether to end a pregnancy. Regardless of the position one wishes to take regarding this decision, the case did spell out specific guidelines. All people would know exactly what the law was, who would interpret the law, and give as reasonable assurance as possible to all concerned that the law would be interpreted the same way in every case.

Further Components of the Conflict Theory

Before attempting an analysis of the material presented thus far, it is necessary to look at some of the additional components of the conflict theory that will be useful in this endeavor. Marx raised the question as to whether sharing a similar position in the economic system was sufficient to create a class without communication of their common interests. He maintained that the concept of class was multi-dimensional (subjective and objective) and that the lack of awareness of class interests is due mostly to the acceptance of the ideologies

developed to support the dominant class and the existing social structure, thus creating a false consciousness.

Marx argued that consolidation of people in the workplace would allow for better communication between them, thus bringing about an increased awareness of their common misery: that rural populations seldom communicated on a sustained basis. Once this line of communication was established and common interests became apparent, the stage was set for action against the common foe--a uniting class consciousness would develop (Johnson 143-45).

Marx viewed the production and class inequality as the basis of society, and so he regarded alienation, inequality and powerlessness as the main sources of social problems (Knapp and Spector 21). He gave four main reasons for this alienation: (1) the product of labor does not belong to the worker, (2) the productive process is controlled by someone other than the worker, (3) this estranges man from his own body, and (4) this estranges man from man (Knapp and Spector 77).

In addition, Marx analyzed the state and religion as contributing to this alienation, though in some way being independent of the members of the civil society who make it up, and giving individuals certain rights as members. In both cases one dimension of human nature is projected onto an external entity that, although created by people, comes to confront people as an alien power to which they must become subject (Johnson 139).

Max Weber, like Karl Marx, recognized classes; however, he placed greater emphasis on the state, political forces, bureaucracy, and status groups (Antonio and Glassman xi). Weber argued that classes themselves were divided into status and party (political) groups and that conflict would arise within as well as between groups (Vander Zanden 223). Weber saw the main roots of modern social problems as being linked in the process of rationalization, secularization, bureaucratization, and specialization (Knapp and Spector 399). Bureaucracies in his opinion would become increasingly powerful and

difficult, if not impossible to control (Antonio and Glassman 24).

Applying the Conflict Theory to the Abortion Issue

Since Marx emphasized that all history is that of class struggles, perhaps it is best to see what classes, using his criteria, have been established thus far. For a class to exist, in his opinion, there must be a sustained communication and an awareness of common problems.

Although there is ample evidence of the existence of medicine men and women in primitive tribes (Tylor), and "no peoples, however primitive, without magic, religion, and science" (Malinowski 17), the earliest written records indicate an established priesthood. These records include the Pyramid texts (2700/2200 B.C.), the epic of Gilgamesh (2000 B.C.), the Hammurabi code (1750 B.C.), and correspond with God's summoning of Abraham (2000 B.C.) (Nielsen 44). The written Talmud, the Old and New Testaments, the Vedes, and the Koran all indicate a wide spread communication among the priesthood and an awareness of class consciousness that meets the criteria of a class according to Marx.

The rise of a scientific medical profession is an entirely different story. Surgical operations were performed in ancient Egypt and depicted on the tombs of the Pharaohs; the Hammurabi code included penalties upon unsuccessful surgeons. Hippocrates (460-377 B.C.) and his school mark the beginning of traceable medical history. However, the establishment of the American Medical Association in 1847 and its continued existence with constant communication to the present time also qualifies the members of this establishment as a class with common interests under the guidelines of Marx.

Two groups meeting Marx's criteria for qualification as a class have been established. However, both of these groups constitute a third group, each exclusively made up of men: the priesthood, attempting to rule the spiritual realm, and the physicians, attempting

to rule the health realm. The legitimacy of men as a third group stems from the patriarchal system: "the patriarchal order of the household is magnified in the governance of village, church, and nation" (Ehrenreich and English 7). In essence, men as the third class controlled the political arena, the government, which in turn has set up bureaucracies that for all practical purposes regulate themselves especially in the health field, a fourth group. "Sexism was inherent in the symbol system of Christianity itself and the primary function of Christianity in Western cultures has been to legitimize sexism" (Daly 17).

It appears at this point that we have established four classes--all composed exclusively of men. However, the Women's Suffrage Movement started to bear fruit with their victory in Wyoming Territory in 1869. In succession several states followed Wyoming's example, and on August 18, 1920, the Nineteenth amendment granting women the right to vote was ratified. This fifth class, composed of women, had little political power, while the regular doctors were steadily increasing in prestige and power.

Alienation and Control of Production or Reproduction

Throughout all of his writings, Marx stressed the importance of the economic structure (the means of production) on the political, religious, educational, and all other social institutions and the alienation of the individual from his work and the workplace (Johnson 129).

Normal procreativity is the central component of Americans' view of female healthiness. "Sarah Everitt Hale wrote in her diary in 1841 that she had experienced eleven childbirths and at least as many more pregnancies by her twenty-fifth wedding anniversary" (Bogdon 103). Margaret Sanger in a speech in 1933 described what she called "slave maternity":

A young woman with ten children wrote that doctors had told her that: I was good for five or six more babies if I could live through it. . . . My husband always told me it was a sin to do anything to keep from having children, but I know better. . . . I get desperate sometimes and feel like killing myself. (Corea 135)

At the opposite end of this spectrum are those women who cannot bear children, for whatever reason, and have been made to feel less that a whole woman because of the predominant religious belief that the main purpose in life for women is giving birth to children.

Applying Marx's concept of alienation in the workplace, it appears that women were considered little more than baby-machines and that their place was in the home. Furthermore, their work in the home had to center around childbearing with no concern regarding their physical or mental ability to perform any other obligation. This alienation has carried over into the public sector.

Between 1950 and 1970, participation by white married women in the labor force nearly doubled. College enrollment among white women aged 16 to 34 increased 57 percent in the 1970's. Among black women it increased by 112 percent (Petchesky 107-115). From 1958 to 1974, white collar jobs for women increased while their participation in other fields decreased. The World War II position of Rosie the Riveter no longer existed, as this was considered a man's job. In 1977, nearly four out of five clerical workers were women, representing nearly 35 percent of all employed women. The median wage for a female clerical worker was 62.3 percent of that paid for her male counterpart. This conception of women's work within the labor force furthers the structures of the organization of the work force. Of the 33 million women working in 1974, 62 percent were in white collar jobs while 21 percent were in service work (Eisentein 208). The notion of the working mother is the latest attempt to define the consciousness of the wage-earning women and is partially to

protect the patriarchal image of women as dependent on man. In this view, she is still primarily a mother, and this secondary-wage status makes her labor cheaper.

Support and Opposition to Abortion

Religious opposition to abortion has never been exclusively Catholic. By 1976, opposition to abortion became a main vehicle for the rise in political influence of Protestant fundamentalism in the United States (Tribe 147). Those who are pro-choice as a group tend to be better educated, have higher incomes and enjoy more of the benefits of life than those who support pro-life. Many of those who support the pro-life position are opposed to artificial means of contraception and believe that sexuality for any purpose other than procreation is wrong. Those most violently opposed to abortion make an explicit connection between such opposition and their desire that women be put back in their traditional roles. Whether in the name of traditional sex roles or in the name of traditional sexual morality, much opposition to abortion seems really to be about the control of women (Tribe 237-38).

Summation and Analysis

The early historical review herein presented shows a male-dominated clergy with the predominate view that women should suffer for the original sin during pregnancy and childbirth. This perspective was carried over into the Middle Ages and was used by the rising class of male doctors during the Renaissance to assist in removing women from the health field via the witch hunts. At the same time, there is considerable indication that abortion, or the use of the then known contraceptives, was at most only frowned upon. Starting in the 1800's, abortion was made a political issue by the regular doctors and by 1900 was brought into the realm of the medical profession, where

it remained until the courts took charge with the Roe v. Wade decision.

It has been shown that from around 1900 till 1962, abortion as an issue was for the most part ignored by the general public, yet there were countless legal and illegal abortions performed during this period. The alienation of women in the workplace, both publicly and at home, has been documented, resulting in the continued control of women's destiny remaining in the hands of the male-dominated clergy, medical profession, government, and bureaucracies. Evidence for the rise to power of these various classes (groups) has been offered. It has been suggested that the male-dominated society attempted to create an inferior human being/ class based upon the peculiar biological nature which at times renders them "unfit for any responsible effort of the mind." Considerable evidence has been offered concerning the concept that at least part of the outcry over abortion stems from attempting to put women back in the home where they supposedly belong.

Possible Alternatives

A better nation-wide comprehensive sex education would be a good starting point since the proper use of all contraceptives, with the exception of surgical ones, involves a certain amount of education. If abortion is murder, as some suggest, then it seems that education which could or would prevent unwanted pregnancies should be a more acceptable alternative. "To the extent that a person is willing to do just about anything to stop abortion except prevent pregnancy, much is revealed about that person's true values and his or her reasons for opposing abortion" (Tribe 212). The development of better male contraceptives and perfection of existing contraceptives would also be beneficial in preventing unwanted pregnancies. Abstinence is not the answer, especially among married couples. In spite of the belief by some that sex should be strictly for procreative purposes, this position

is not adhered to by many in our society today. Making the male equally responsible does not seem unreasonable. Proposed long-lasting but reversible contraceptives, either mechanical or chemical, also seem promising (Tribe 213).

Conclusions

After reviewing the data, one may conclude that abortion is not the main issue. The issue is the position women will occupy in present and future society. Refusing a woman's right to make her own decision about abortion is forcing her to become a parent without regard for her wishes. It does not take into account her physical, mental, or economic capacity for such a long-term commitment. Being a parent is difficult enough for an individual without having parenthood forced upon one.

While the woman is obliged to become a parent, in a vast number of instances the father never becomes a parent, as the large number of single welfare-mothers indicates. The list of legitimate and illegitimate fathers that contribute nothing to the support of their children is lengthy. If no consideration is given to the possibility of a malformed child being born because of disease or drug use (both legal and illegal) by either parent, then the added burden on the parent(s) and the welfare system increases dramatically.

Forcing a woman to become a parent limits her role in society. The social expectation is for her to be a mother first and any other role is secondary. This attitude is exemplified in the public work sector by limiting a woman's field of endeavor regardless of her qualifications. The double pay standard for the same work implies that the religious position of a woman's place being at home is acceptable.

Most objections to abortion stem from a religious position. According to Laurence Tribe, the abortion issue centers more on the control of women than "the sanctity of life or of nature" (Tribe 241).

Endnotes

¹Sherri Finkbine (the star of her own local children's television show in Phoenix, Arizona) was married, the mother of four children under seven when she discovered the sleeping pill she had been using was Thalidomide. She immediately contacted her doctor who firmly suggested a therapeutic abortion and booked her into a local hospital. He wrote a letter to the hospital's three-member therapeutic abortion board who concurred with his decision. However, the local paper ran a banner headline, "Baby-Deforming Drug May Cost Woman Her Child Here." Mrs. Finkbine eventually went to Sweden where an abortion was performed and the embryo was found to be severely deformed. (Faux 49-53)

Works Cited

- Antonio, Robert J. and Ronald M. Glassman, eds. *A Marx-Weber Dialogue*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 1985.
- Bogdan, Janet Carlisle. "Childbirth in America, 1650 to 1990." *Women, Health, and Medicine in America*. Ed. Rima D. Apple. New York: Garland, 1990.
- Corea, Gena. *The Hidden Malpractice*. New York: Harper, 1977.
- Daly, Mary. *The Church and The Second Sex*. New York: Harper, 1968.

- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Deidre English. *For Her Own Good*. New York: Anchor Books, 1978.
- Einstein, Zillah R. . *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. New York: Longman, 1981.
- Faux, Marian. *Roe v. Wade*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Johnson, Doyle Paul. *Sociological Theory*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.
- Knapp, Peter and Alan J. Spector. *Crisis and Change*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1981.
- Luker, Kristin. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Magic, Science, and Religion*. 1926. Garden City, New York: Free Press, 1948.
- Marx, Karl. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. 1848. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952.
- Nielson, Niels C., et al. *Religions of the World*. New York: St. Martin's, 1983.
- Mohr, James C. *Abortion in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Persell, Caroline Hodges. *Understanding Society*. New York: Harper, 1984.
- Petchesky, Rosalind Pollack. *Abortion and Woman's Choice*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1984.

- Reiss, Ira I. *And End to Shame: Shaping Our Next Sexual Revolution*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1990.
- Ritzer, George. *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Knopf, 1990.
- Tribe, Laurence H. *Abortion and the Clash of Absolutes*. New York: Norton, 1990.
- Tylor, Edward Burnett. *Religion in Primitive Culture*. New York: Harper, 1970.
- Wertz, Richard W. and Dorothy C. Wertz. "Notes on the Decline of Midwives and the Rise of Medical Obstetricians." *The Sociology of Health and Illness*. 2nd ed. Eds. Peter Conrad and Rochelle Kern. New York: St. Martin's, 1986.
- Vander Zanden, James W. *The Social Experience*. New York: Random House, 1988.

Feminist Psychology in Relation to Depression and Anger in Women

Vicki O'Brien

According to P. Susan Penfold and Gillian A. Walker in *Women and the Psychiatric Paradox*, "For every male diagnosed as suffering from depression, two to six times as many females are so diagnosed" (173). The higher incidence among females leads one to question why this is so. Are women more prone to depression due to biological factors? Are women weaker psychologically? Is a woman's environment more depressing than a man's? I propose that women are over-represented in this area of illness in large part due to societal demands, conflicting gender roles, learned coping behaviors, and a long-standing gender bias within culture as well as within psychology as a profession.

In 1927, Alfred Adler, a prominent psychoanalyst, spoke of the gender bias which permeates every aspect of society. In his book *Understanding Human Nature*, he states:

One of the bitter consequences of the prejudice concerning the inferiority of women is the sharp division and pigeon-holing of concepts according to a scheme; thus "masculine" signifies worth-while, powerful, victorious, capable, whereas "feminine" becomes identical with obedient, servile, subordinate. This type of thinking has become so deeply anchored in human thought processes that in our civilization everything laudable has a "masculine" color, whereas everything less valuable or actually derogatory is designated "feminine." (132-3)

Since this gender bias permeates our culture it only stands to reason that it must also affect our theories of psychology and the objectivity of the clinicians. Studies have indicated that in the present century, gender stereotypes continue to influence psychological assessment and individual clinical objectivity. Phyllis Chesler in *Women and Madness* details the results of a study done by Broverman et al. in 1970. Seventy-nine clinicians (male and female) completed a sex role stereotype questionnaire. The clinicians were to check off traits that they felt represented healthy males, healthy females, or healthy adult behavior. Chesler cites the following results:

- 1) There was a high agreement among clinicians as to the attributes characterizing healthy adult males, healthy adult females, and healthy adults.
- 2) There were no significant differences between male and female clinicians.
- 3) Clinicians had different standards of health for men and women. Their concepts of healthy mature men did not differ significantly from their concepts of healthy mature adults, but their concepts of healthy mature women did differ significantly from those for men and adults. Clinicians were likely to suggest that women differ from healthy men by being more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable in a minor crisis, more easily hurt, more emotional, more conceited about their appearance, less objective, and less interested in math and science. (68)

If a "normal" woman's attributes are generally conceived of as more negative than those of a man, then it stands to reason that they

would be more often diagnosed as mentally inferior, or mentally "ill." Adding to the inherent bias of the male-defined theories of psychology is the problem of the under-representation of females in the profession. According to Corinne Squire in *Significant Differences: Feminism in Psychology*, in 1989 "women comprised only three tenths of the U. S. psychological work force" (11). She also points out that women tend to be in the lower-status "service" jobs instead of the higher-status theory-producing and policy-making positions. This results in males defining appropriate female behavior without the benefit of the female viewpoint. Since female issues are viewed as less important, they often are not represented in male-defined theory.

Chesler states, "In 1964 the number of American women being psychiatrically 'serviced' began to suddenly or at least measurably increase. . . The increase may be understood not only in the context of the 'help seeking' nature of the female role, or the objective oppression of women, but in the context of at least three recent social trends" (33). The first trend is that of society permitting more visibility to mental illness. The second trend she speaks of is that of women living longer and in a sense outliving their usefulness as wives and mothers. The third trend is "related to our society's atheism, ownership of the tangible: no longer are women sacrificed as voluntary or involuntary witches. They are, instead, taught to sacrifice themselves for newly named heresies" (34).

In present day society, women are expected to fulfill many demands. A woman may be expected to hold a full-time job, perform all household tasks, bear the burden of child care, and to do all of this while remaining "feminine." Not only are these tremendous physical and emotional demands upon a woman, but they also are often conflicting roles. To succeed in the work place often requires the "male" attributes of assertiveness and drive. When the internal conflicts result in psychologically manifested disturbances such as depression or anger, therapy is often sought. Chesler, in speaking of the difference in feminist therapy over traditional therapy, believes, "A

woman needs to be told that she's 'not crazy'; that it's normal to feel sad or angry about being overworked, undervalued, and underpaid; that it's healthy to harbor fantasies of running away when the needs of others (aging parents, needy husbands, demanding children) threaten to overwhelm her" (xxi). The main ideas here are that depression/anger in women may not be as much a symptom of mental illness as it is a natural and appropriate response to oppression.

Jean Baker Miller in *Toward a New Psychology of Women* echoes this belief in her chapters "Domination-Subordination" and "Conflict--The old way." Miller equates the male gender with the dominating group in culture and the female gender with the subordinate group. She writes, "Subordinates are described in terms of, and encouraged to develop, personal psychological characteristics that are pleasing to the dominant group" (7). She further explains, "A subordinate group has to concentrate on basic survival. Accordingly, direct, honest reaction to destructive treatment is avoided. Open, self-initiated action in its own self-interest must be avoided. . . . In our own society, a woman's direct action can result in a combination of economic hardship, social ostracism, and psychological isolation and even the diagnosis of personality disorder" (10).

When viewed with a feminist perspective, depression and repression of anger appear to be reasonable and prudent responses for women. "Traditionally, depression has been conceived of as the response to--or expression of--loss, either of an ambivalently loved other, of the 'ideal self,' or of 'meaning' in one's life. . . . Depression rather than aggression is the female response to disappointment or loss" (Chesler 44). Women often avoid open, direct conflict due to their perceived disadvantaged position. They instead meet their needs indirectly. Of such is born the concept of a "woman's wiles." Through the process of "manipulation," the woman may get her needs met without the risk factors associated with direct confrontation (Miller 13-20). Traditionally, manipulation is seen as a bad thing, but viewed from a feminist perspective it can be seen as a rational and

reasonable behavior used by a subordinate to get what she needs without adverse consequences from the dominant party. This is not to say that manipulation is the desired way to obtain one's needs, but in the case of oppression it may be the least risky. One goal of feminist psychology is to teach women a more direct and open way of dealing with conflict.

Vasanti Burtle's chapter on "Therapeutic Anger in Women" in *The Handbook of Feminist Theory* explores the issue of anger in women. Burtle contends that "acted out anger is socially and legally censured in virtually every culture. Women in cultures that foster rigid gender role demarcations have found that the proscription against acting out extend even to the experience of anger. The 'normal' woman is thus perceived socially as passive in terms of acted-out behavior and passionless in her inner experience of an important human emotion" (70). She purports that "the feminist clinician needs to examine how the client's personality and the socialized suppression of anger intermesh as catalysts for pathology" (71). She also points out, "The angry self-image, while negative for many men, is often abnormal or grotesque to women" (75). Burtle goes on to discuss how many women deny their angry feelings. She describes a therapeutic process where she has the women draw their feelings. The drawings are varied, "[s]ome showing turmoil in a tangle of colored scribbles, others persisting in denial through drawings of flowers or smiling faces, and others reflecting the black hues and trapped configurations of depression. Once the client is convinced that she will not be condemned for whatever extremes of anger she has illustrated, she usually will be ready to discuss the drawing. In so doing, she is enabled to describe her actual feelings of anger as well as the feelings from which the anger emanated" (75-6).

Knowledge of oppression and the resulting anger can be very therapeutic for women as well as men. In the *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Doug DeVoe's article "Feminist and Nonsexist Counseling: Implications for the Male Counselor" speaks of the need

for males to be alert to these issues in dealing with women clients. He states, "For some women, because of previous dependence on men, their emotional responses to anger are more likely to be repressed and viewed as unacceptable." He also points out that instead of a counselor's maleness being a detrimental factor in dealing with female anger, "Men's greater, or perhaps different, familiarity with anger, autonomy and power can potentially provide therapeutic benefit for their women clients. . . . For many feminists, anger is perceived as the major issue for women and as an appropriate response to oppression."

In the *Handbook of Feminist Therapy*, Adrienne Smith and Ruth Siegel state, "Feminist theory can be divided into three stages. The first stage enables the woman to recognize the social etiology of her so-called pathology, that is, to understand that the personal is political. The second stage introduces the woman to her own strengths by redefining her use of power The third and final stage supports the woman as she experiments with new, more effective behaviors in her personal and work environments" (18). Contrary to popular stereotypes, women are not weak and do possess many strengths. Women need to redefine strength in feminist terms. Emotions, cooperation, and creativity are a few of the strengths of women examined by Miller in her book. Emotions are typically viewed by the male-defined culture as a weakness and thus feminine. In redefining emotions with a feminist viewpoint, they become valuable strengths of women. "There is no question that most women have a much greater sense of the emotional components of all human activity than most men. This is, in part, a result of their training as subordinates; for anyone in a subordinate position must learn to be attuned to the vicissitudes of mood, pleasure, and displeasure of the dominant group. . . . Subordinate groups can use these developed abilities as one of the few weapons available in the struggle with the dominants, and women have often done so. 'Womanly wiles' and 'womanly intuition' are examples. But, however attained, these

qualities bespeak a basic ability that is very valuable" (Miller 38).

DeVoe cites K. Offen as stating that "to consider oneself as possessing the characteristics of a feminist, three criteria must be met:

- 1) When assessing a woman's status in society relative to men, counselors must acknowledge women's values as their own rather than think of them as the aesthetic ideal of womanhood invented by men, and they must recognize the validity of a woman's own interpretation of her lived experience.
- 2) When experiencing institutionalized injustice or inequality toward women by men as a group, women should exhibit a consciousness of it, discomfort, or even anger over its existence.
- 3) Women challenge the coercive power, force, or authority that upholds male prerogatives in a culture and advocate the elimination of injustice. Feminists must necessarily be at odds with the male-dominated culture and society. (Offen 1988)

Feminist psychology is essential to liberating men and women from the destructive effects of gender inequality in our culture. We must begin to demolish all forms of oppression and rebuild a more equitable state of affairs for our sons and daughters in the future. In summation, I present to you a quote from Alfred Adler:

As things stand now, there is a constant striving on the part of men to dominate women, and an appropriate dissatisfaction with masculine domination on the part of women. Since the two sexes are so narrowly connected, it is easily conceivable that this constant

tension leads to psychic dissonances and to far-reaching physical disturbances which must of necessity be extraordinarily painful to both sexes. (123)

Works Cited

- Adler, Alfred. *Understanding Human Nature*. London: Ruskin House, 1928.
- Chesler, Phyllis. *Women and Madness*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989.
- DeVoe, Doug. "Feminist and Nonsexist Counseling: Implications for the Male Counselor." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 69.3 (1990): 33-6.
- Miller, Jean Baker. *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.
- Penfold, P. Susan and Gillian A. Walker. *Women and the Psychiatric Paradox*. London: Eden Press, 1983.
- Rosewater, Lynne Bravo and Leonore Walker. *Handbook of Feminist Therapy*. New York: Springer, 1985.
- Squire, Corinne. *Significant Differences: Feminism in Psychology*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Names and Terms for God Explained

Answers to the Crossword Puzzle "Names and Terms for God," which appeared in Volume V of *Logos-Sophia*, pp. 70-71.

Down

1. The Hebrew verb meaning "to create" used only of divine creativity is *bara* (Genesis 1.1).
2. The Hebrew word for "Lord" used in place of God's proper name (see 7 Across) is *Adonai*.
3. The semitic word for "God" and the name of the chief Canaanite god is *El* (e.g. Genesis 6.3).
5. The Greek word for "being a friend" is *philos*. In conjunction with *sophia* ("wisdom") it is "philosophy," or "being a friend of wisdom" (e.g. John 21.15 where Peter calls Jesus his friend).
6. The Mesopotamian word meaning "of the mountains" or "of the breasts" that came to mean "Almighty" is *Shaddai* (cf. Genesis 49.25).
9. The Greek word meaning "reason" or "theory," which is used in the New Testament to refer to Christ as the "word" of God is *logos* (e.g. John 1.1).

Across

2. The Greek word for God's love in the New Testament is *agape* (e.g. I John 4.8).
4. The name *Jehovah* was created by combining the vowels in "Adonai" (see 2 Down) with the tetragrammaton "JHWH," also transcribed "YHWH" (see 7 Across). *Jehovah* is a late medieval invention and is used in the King James Version of the Bible, first published in 1611.
6. The first work of God's creation, according to Proverbs 8.22-30 was *Sophia*, which is Greek for "wisdom."
7. The proper name of God in Jewish scripture is *Yahweh*.

Hebrew vowels are understood and spoken, but not written. Thus, the literal written English equivalent of "Yahweh" is "YHWH" (e.g. Genesis 2.4)--when written in Hebrew this is called the tetragrammaton.

8. The Arabic name for God used by Muslims is *Allah*.
10. When the divine being is portrayed as female, she is called a *Goddess*.
11. The title of God used some 250 times in the Hebrew canon which simply means "God," is *Elohim* (e.g. Genesis 1.1).

Editor's Note: I have developed this crossword puzzle as a teaching tool and have used it for a number of years in classes in Basic Philosophy and Religions of the World. The idea is to teach students the variety of ways that people have thought and spoken of God, even within the restricted focus of Western religion, especially in biblical and Quranic religion.

Very often the differences in meaning for the words used for God are obscured by English translations. For instance, "Elohim," "Yahweh," and "El" are indifferently translated as "God." And when the expression "El Shaddai" is translated "God Almighty," the original sense that people were referring to a mountain deity is lost. The noted Hebrew scholar Phyllis Tribble remarks on the fact that the feminine connotations of "El Shaddai" are lost in translation. It seems that in ancient times no less than today, mountains have been associated with women's breasts. ("Les Grandes Tetons" is French for "Big Tits.")

Another example of the failure of some translations is John 21, where both "agape" and "philia" are indifferently translated "love," thus obscuring an important meaning of the passage. Peter, in all honesty, cannot confess an agape-type love for Jesus. When Jesus acknowledges this in verse 17 by asking Peter whether he is his friend (as opposed to whether Peter has agape-type love for him), Peter is emotionally shaken. When both words are translated "love," this dramatic redemptive moment in the story is lost.

The P.S.U. Philosophical Society Constitution

ARTICLE I: Name

The name of this organization shall be Logos-Sophia: The P.S.U. Philosophical Society.

ARTICLE II: Objectives

The objectives of this organization shall be to promote philosophical activity at Pittsburg State University by sponsoring speakers, supporting library acquisitions, addressing philosophical questions through published writings by the members, and taking trips to philosophical conferences.

ARTICLE III: Membership

Membership shall be open to all interested members.

ARTICLE IV: Officers

The officers shall be students enrolled at Pittsburg State University, with the exception that the Faculty Advisor may serve as Treasurer.

ARTICLE V: Offices

The offices shall be President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and Creative Director.

ARTICLE VI: Elections

The officers shall be elected to serve one year terms by a majority vote of active members at the last meeting before the fall semester begins.

ARTICLE VII: Filling the Vacancies

Should an office vacancy occur, a new officer shall be elected by a majority vote of active members at the next meeting. The elected officer shall serve until the next regular election (See Article VI: Elections).

ARTICLE VIII: Duties of Officers

The officers' duties shall be the following:

- A. The President shall preside over all discussions of club activities and policies as well as attend the meetings for presidents of organizations at Pittsburg State University.
- B. The Vice President shall assume the presidential responsibilities specifically given to him/her by the President in his/her absence.
- C. The Secretary shall keep accurate minutes of all meetings and keep records of the organization not kept by the Treasurer.
- D. The Treasurer shall keep the financial records of the organization.
- E. The Creative Director shall be in charge of media for the organization.

ARTICLE IX: Meetings

This organization shall meet no less than one (1) time per month. Meeting times and places shall be determined by the President and, whenever possible, by a majority of the members.

ARTICLE X: Voting

All voting shall be determined by a majority of the number of voting members of the organization. Therefore, a majority of the voting members must be present, or present by proxy, at a meeting before business may be conducted. (Note: Honorary members of the organization are not voting members.)

ARTICLE XI: Proxies

Should a member be unable to attend a meeting, he/she may, by proxy, let another member vote for him/her (See Article X: Voting). Proof of proxy claim's authenticity must be made by written authorization or verbal communication, by telephone, etc., to the President (or Vice President in his/her absence) or to the Faculty Advisor.

ARTICLE XII: Amendments

Amendments to this constitution shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the voting membership.

AMENDMENT 1--ARTICLE I

The name of this organization shall be The P.S.U. Philosophical Society. Amended 9-10-87

AMENDMENT 2--ARTICLE III

Membership in this organization requires the payment of dues at the rate of either \$2.00 per semester or \$3.00 per school year. The dues shall be paid by the third consecutive meeting. Amended 9-10-87

LOGOS-SOPHIA
THE PSU PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
VOLUME 6, SPRING 1994